q HN 385.5
(in box)

OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS
SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION

Management Attitudes and Practices towards Women at Work

An employment policy survey carried out
on behalf of the Department of Employment

Audrey Hunt

SOUTHAMPTON
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY

HMSO £5 net

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Date of Issue

~~19. OCT. 1981~~
2 0 JUL 1989
AUG
returned
12. NOV 90
2 OCT 1990
returned
0 OCT 96
RETURNED
22 OCT 1996
0 OCT 1996

SOUTHAMPTON
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

BOOK NUMBER	75-084875
CLASS MARK	q HN 385·5
	(in box)

75084875

OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS
SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION

Management Attitudes and Practices towards Women at Work

An employment policy survey carried out
in 1973 by the Social Survey Division of the
Office of Population Censuses and Surveys
on behalf of the Department of Employment

Audrey Hunt

London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1975

© Crown copyright 1975

ISBN 0 11 700691 2

SOUTHAMPTON
LIBRARY
*
UNIVERSITY

Contents

Chapter		Page
I	Introduction	1
II	The achieved sample	4
III	Validity, presentation and interpretation of the figures	6
IV	Definition of terms used	8
V	General summary of findings	9
VI	Status and duties of formulators and implementers	24
VII	Background information	28
VIII	Joint formulators and implementers	42
IX	Management attitudes to equality at work	45
X	Appointments and promotions	77
XI	Aspects of employee performance	93
XII	Facilities and fringe benefits	110
XIII	Protective legislation, working hours and shift working	133
XIV	Part-time workers	141
XV	The first step towards equality	159
XVI	Managements' suggestions for improving womens' opportunities	168
XVII	Jobs done by men and by women	173
XVIII	Employers' associations and trade unions	191
Appendix		
I	Note on the sample design	195
IIa	Information about numbers employed, obtained at sampling stage	197
IIb	Questions asked of formulators and implementers	198
IIc	Questions asked of formulators	203
IId	Preliminary information from implementers	213
IIe	Questions asked of implementers	214

Purpos

Meth

Chapter I Introduction

Purpose of the survey

The Survey was carried out by the Social Survey Division of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys on behalf of the Department of Employment (DE). Its object was to find out in what fields differences in conditions and opportunities exist between men and women, and to define attitudes to these differences. It is hoped that this will throw light on possible ways of reducing or eliminating differences in those fields where they are not justifiable or reasonable.

Method

A sample of establishments with 100 or more employees was selected from the following industries (the main groups are those used for analysis throughout the report).

Food etc. manufacture: Food, drink and tobacco; coal and petroleum products; chemicals and allied industries.

Engineering etc: Metal manufacture; mechanical engineering; instrument engineering; electrical engineering; shipbuilding; vehicles; metal goods not elsewhere specified.

Textiles etc: Textiles; leather, leather goods and fur; clothing and footwear; bricks, pottery, etc; timber, furniture etc; paper, printing and publishing; other manufacturing industries.

Transport etc: Transport and communications.

Commerce etc: Commerce, miscellaneous services.

Distribution: Distributive trades.

At the request of the Department of Employment, industries where few women are employed were excluded, as were central and local government. Sampling difficulties led to the exclusion of certain other industries. Industrial orders thus excluded are: agriculture; mining and quarrying; gas, electricity and water; professional services’, public administration.

At each establishment attempts were made to interview:

The formulator of personnel policy
The implementer of personnel policy towards women
First-line managers in two departments
Second-line managers in these departments
Two women employees in each department
Two men employees in each department
The shop stewards (where applicable) for each employee interviewed.

The nature of the questionnaires varied according to the status of the informant, but all included questions about the background of the individuals and about their attitudes to various aspects of equality for women.

The sampling method used has certain limitations, as explained in the appendix, but insofar as establishments are concerned, the findings can be regarded as representative of all establishments with 100 or more employees in the selected industries. The same holds true for formulators and implementers. A note on the validity of the findings follows the Introduction.

Management attitudes and practices

This report is based almost entirely on the answers given by the formulators and implementers of personnel policy, together with information obtained at the sampling stage about numbers and categories of employees at the establishments. On a few occasions it was not possible to interview both formulator and implementer. In such cases the establishment has been included, provided adequate information was obtained from the one interviewed. Consequently the sample of establishments differs slightly for formulators and implementers.

As was only to be expected, the structure of the establishments varied widely and the status, background and functions of formulators and implementers are by no means uniform.

Formulators were not necessarily responsible on their own for policy: sometimes they were personnel directors or managers, sometimes they combined their personnel functions with others. Occasionally they were situated at another establishment (this occurred where the selected establishment was part of a combine or was one branch of a firm with a number of branches).

In about half the establishments the two functions were combined. When this occurred the person concerned was asked some of the formulator and some of the implementer questions, the object being to obtain as much information as possible without subjecting the informant to an interview of intolerable length. In the tables these individuals have been treated as both formulators and implementers. (Details are given of the characteristics of those people who fulfil the joint function and those who do not.)

The information obtained covered both personnel practices towards men and women at the establishment and also the background and attitudes of the formulators and implementers. There is much evidence that existing differences in employment practices spring from the attitudes of society as a whole and it is useful to find out how far these attitudes are shared by the people who will be mainly responsible for carrying out any alterations in practice.

The demographic and other characteristics of formulators and implementers are given in the report, but it is worth mentioning here that only 3 of those who participate in policy making and only 18 of those who carry out policy are women (unweighted figures).

The questions asked

The questions asked of formulators and implementers are given in Appendix II.

Fieldwork dates

A pilot study was carried out in September and October 1972, to test the sampling method and the efficiency of the questionnaires. For the main survey, letters were sent to selected establishments in October 1972. During November and early December interviewers called at establishments which had agreed to participate, when they obtained information about numbers and categories of employees and carried out the procedures necessary to select the individuals to be interviewed. Letters were distributed to all those selected for interview.

Interviewing was conducted during the period January to March 1973. If management agreed that interviews could be carried out at the work place and were willing to provide facilities which ensured privacy, informants were offered the choice of being interviewed at the work place or at home. Otherwise interviews were carried out at informants' homes.

Acknowledgements

Surveys are always a product of team work and this in particular was a difficult assignment for all the Technical Branches of the Social Survey Division. Special thanks are therefore due to Sampling, Field Coding and Computing for the skill and enthusiasm with which they tackled the complex problems which arose.

Without wishing to detract from the merits of the efforts of many others, special mention must be made of the contribution of Joan Cowie of Computing Branch, who helped to produce order when the difficulties seemed almost insuperable.

Above all, my thanks are due to Doris Evans, who assisted me through all stages of this survey and without whose help this report could not have been produced.

Finally, I should like to thank all the managements of the establishments which cooperated in the survey and the individuals whom we interviewed for their interest and willingness to be questioned.

Chapter II The achieved sample

403 establishments were selected from the lists at local offices of the Department of Employment. Local offices are not always kept fully informed about changes in the situation at establishments and 4 of those selected were subsequently found to be ineligible as they had closed down or employed a great deal fewer than 100 workers. Another was found to be in reality part of another establishment also selected.

The actual set sample was therefore *398*.

As a first step these establishments were approached by letter, explaining the background and purpose of the survey and asking for their co-operation. No reply was received from *70* establishments, in spite of a follow-up letter.

Refusals were received from *58* establishments, the reasons given being as follows:

Reason	*Total No.*
Too busy, cannot spare time	11
Industrial relations problems	6
Thinks survey does not serve any useful purpose	5
Thinks establishment cannot provide any useful information	5
Internal re-organisation	5
Closing down	5
Does not wish to participate, no other reason given	21
Total	*58*

The original letter had explained that the first stage of the survey would involve a call by an interviewer to select the individuals to be interviewed at the establishment. In spite of having previously signified their agreement to participate, a further *18* establishments refused at this stage, the reasons given being as follows:

Reason	*No.*
Industrial relations problems	2
Internal re-organisation, closing down	2
Would take too much time	2
Unwilling to give required information	1
Instructions from 'higher up'	3
Would entail loss of production	2
Prefer not to, would not permit interviewer to call (no reason given)	6
Total	*18*

At the interviewing stage a further *29* establishments refused to participate, the reasons given being as follows:

Reason	*No.*
Industrial relations difficulties	5
Internal re-organisation	2
Would take too much time	2
Instructions from 'higher up'	3
Would entail loss of production	1
Prefer not to, would not permit interviewer to call (no reason given)	16
Total	*29*

Thus, interviews were achieved at *223* establishments, giving a success rate of 56.0%. This is not as high as could be wished, but is of the same order of magnitude as that obtained for other recent surveys based on establishments. It seems likely that plans for any surveys on such a basis will need to take account of the probability of this level of success.

A successful interview was obtained with the formulator of personnel policy and with the implementer of personnel policy at nearly all the 223 establishments. Sometimes one individual combined the two functions (details are given elsewhere). Counting these as both formulators and implementers, interviews were obtained with 212 formulators and 222 implementers.

It is not possible to calculate an exact success rate for individuals within establishments because in a number of instances inadequate information or none was obtained about the structure of the establishment. Also, changes in structure and personnel occasionally occurred between the time of sampling and the time of interviewing. The following shows the numbers of individuals selected at the sampling stage (including those at establishments which subsequently refused to permit any interviewing) and the numbers of interviews actually achieved. (Percentages read across).

	Selected	*Interviewed*		*Refusals by:* *Estabs:*		*Individuals*	
	No.	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Formulators	119	101	84.9	9	7.6	9	7.6
Implementers	123	111	90.2	12	9.8	–	–
Joint formulator/implementers	131	111	84.7	11	8.4	9	6.9
Second line managers	356	304	85.4	29	8.1	23	6.5
First line supervisors	416	350	86.5	36	8.7	20	4.8
Women employees	537	444	82.7	63	11.7	30	5.6
Men employees	680	539	79.3	73	10.7	68	10.0
Shop stewards	268	224	83.6	25	9.3	19	7.1

The set and achieved samples correspond closely in terms of region and size of establishment. The set sample was not stratified by industry but the non-response rate was a little higher in the manufacturing than in the non-manufacturing industries.

Chapter III Validity, presentation and interpretation of the figures

The sample and weighting

The sample of establishments was selected in such a manner as to ensure as good a representation of the selected industries as possible. Region and size of establishment had also to be taken into account. Consequently the sampling fractions are different for different establishments and the proportions in the final sample are not representative of the true position. In order to produce tables which are representative of all establishments in the selected industries the numbers have been arithmetically weighted to restore true proportions. *The percentages are based on the weighted base figures, but significance tests must be based on the unweighted base figures.* Both sets of base figures are shown in the table.

Validity of the figures in this report

This note is intended to explain the extent to which individual findings of the survey can be regarded as those of a representative sample constructed according to statistical principles and therefore as being reliable within the standard sampling limitations.

None of the findings can be regarded as applying to industries other than those covered by the survey. This proviso must be borne in mind throughout.

Tables and findings based on 'all formulators', 'all implementers', 'all establishments' and "all departments" (weighted in accordance with the varying sampling fractions used) can be taken as being reliable within standard sampling limitations. This applies to tables showing relationships between individuals at establishments.

The other individuals who were interviewed do not constitute samples in the statistical sense of the word, because the individuals were not selected with equal probability. Tables and findings relating to them can be regarded only as providing indications of what the facts and attitudes might be. They are shown in an unweighted form, because weighting factors could not be calculated without a knowledge of individual probabilities. The tables must not be used as the basis for any kind of exact estimates. Their value lies chiefly in the light they shed on attitudes and practices which exist and in the indications they provide of fields in which further research might well be productive.

Tables to which this restriction applies are those based on first and second line managers, men and women employees and shop stewards. The base figures will be designated as "all first-line managers interviewed" etc. so as to differentiate them from tables based on true samples.

(Very few such tables appear in the management practices report. They are occasionally included where they appear to shed further light on a finding.)

Presentation of figures

The numbers in some groups are small, particularly in the case of industrial groups. It was not always possible to combine groups in a logical fashion. To have done so would in some cases have resulted in the loss of information, because differences are sometimes so great that they can be accepted as significant. The usual practice for small numbers is to show absolute figures rather than percentages, but, where heavy weighting is involved, as in the present case, to show either weighted or unweighted absolute figures would be confusing. Percentages have therefore been given, enclosed in brackets. Such percentages should be treated with caution.

Interpretation of comparisons between formulators and implementers

Some of the attributes which have been used for analysis are characteristics of the individuals themselves, namely, age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay, discrimination index. Others are attributes of the establishments for which they are responsible. It must be remembered that when comparing formulators and implementers in respect of *personal characteristics,* we are *not* comparing people from the same establishments. In the case of *characteristics of establishments,* the people concerned *are* from the same establishments.

Another factor to be borne in mind is that where questions are common to formulators and implementers, individuals who combine these two functions are included in the figures for both. This has been done because we are primarily concerned with the function within the establishment, rather than with the individual. To have shown the three groups (formulators only; implementers only; joint) would not have been practicable because the numbers in many of the sub-groups would not justify analysis. When considering tables relating to common questions the existence of this overlap should be remembered.

Chapter IV Definitions of terms used

Establishment	The definition used in this survey was: 'the business of a single employer (i.e. a single individual, partnership or company) occupying a single set of premises or part of premises. Premises occupied by an employer will be regarded as constituting the site of a single establishment if access to all parts of the premises is available without leaving them. Exceptions to this ruling may be agreed to (if the employer so wishes) to enable establishments to be divided or aggregated.'
Formulator	The formulator is the person responsible for personnel policy at the selected establishment. He may or may not actually work at the establishment (as in the case of a firm with many branches, divisions, etc. where personnel policy is decided centrally). He must have some say in determining policy, either on his own or in consultation (e.g. with other members of a board). He may combine other functions with that of formulator.
Implementer	The implementer is the person responsible for carrying out personnel policy towards women in the selected establishment. He (or, rarely, she) may also be responsible for carrying out policy towards men. He may combine other functions with that of implementer. He must be responsible for more than merely welfare work.
Terminal education age	This is the age at which the informant's full-time education finished.
Discrimination index	This has been derived from informants' attitudes to three basic aspects of equality between the sexes: equal pay; more women in senior positions; training of women for more highly skilled work. The index consists of four groups: those in favour of all three aspects; in favour of any two; in favour of any one; in favour of none. The numbers in the last group are small but it is useful to show them separately in some tables.
Attitude to equal pay	Because few informants actually said they were against equal pay, in tables analysed by this breakdown we have shown two groups only: those in favour; those neutral or opposed.
CODOT Classification of Occupations	This has been constructed by DE on the basis of the work actually done by an individual. In its complete form it permits of very detailed classification. However under the conditions of this survey, from the information obtained about jobs, we were able to use only the 'Minor Groups'. The descriptions of these in the tables should be self-explanatory. (Full details of the method of construction and of the classification can be obtained from volumes published by HMSO).

Broad region (see Appendix I for a description of the basis of this regional classification). The regions used in the analyses are as follows:

	Standard Regions included
Central and Wales (described as *Central)*	East and West Midlands, East Anglia, Yorkshire, and Humberside, South West, Wales.
	South East, GLC
Northern and Scotland (described for brevity as *"Northern")*	Scotland, North, North West
Southern	All others

Chapter V General summary of findings

FORMULATORS AND IMPLEMENTERS: THEIR STATUS, BACKGROUND AND ATTITUDES

Introduction

To some extent the success of anti-discrimination measures will depend at the work place on the people responsible for formulating personnel policy and implementing it towards women. It is therefore important to know, firstly, what is the status of these people (in order to assess the likely extent of their influence), and secondly, their personal background and attitudes.

Status

Three-quarters of formulators but less than three-fifths of implementers are directly responsible to a chairman, managing director or board of directors. If we leave out of account those who fulfil the joint function, only 41.9% of implementers are responsible to board level. The few women implementers are of very much lower status, only one-fifth being responsible to board level, compared with twice that proportion of men implementers.

Demographic characteristics

Only 2.0% of formulators and 11.5% of implementers are women. (It is worth noting that 38.5% of all employees in Great Britain are women.)

The number of women formulators is far too small for detailed analysis. Implementers are by definition of lower status than formulators and we have found that women implementers are of lower status than their masculine counterparts. It is not likely, therefore, that the direct influence of women will have much effect on higher management.

In establishments where half or more of the employees are women, only one-quarter of implementers are women and in establishments with 250 or more women employees one-sixth are women. In the engineering industry about one in forty implementers is a woman.

A majority of formulators and of both men and women implementers come into the 40-54 age group. All have an average age which is higher than that of the working population as a whole. This is not unexpected, because the posts they hold are at a level unlikely to be reached by many men (or women) in the lower age groups.

Educational level

On average formulators and, to a lesser extent, implementers have a higher educational level than men workers as a whole. There is very little difference in this respect between women implementers and working women as a whole. The average educational level of women implementers is considerably lower than that found in an earlier survey for women in managerial jobs as a whole. This may be because the present survey excludes a number of industries which demand a higher educational level in posts classed as managerial and which also attract more highly educated women.

31.0% of formulators and 19.2% of men implementers have qualifications of degree standard, but only 6.3% of women implementers. HNC and HND (which are included in these figures) are not found at all among women implementers, nor are ONC or City and Guilds examinations.

Training

95.2% of women implementers, compared with 80.4% of men implementers and 81.7% of formulators have received on the job training, either from their present firm or from another firm. (An earlier survey found that only about one-quarter of women's jobs carried an element of training.) 60.3% of women implementers, compared with 8.2% of men implementers and 6.1% of formulators, have received training in office jobs.

It is interesting that the percentages who have received training in personnel management (33.3% of women implementers, 27.4% of men implementers, 23.8% of formulaters) and in management (industrial operations) (19.0% of women implementers, 18.8% of men implementers, 17.7% of formulators) do not differ significantly.

It would not be justifiable to make firm deductions from the small number of women implementers, but the impression is given that most of them have reached their positions by the hard route of starting at a low level (most often in an office job) whereas appreciable proportions of men implementers and formulators have started off with the advantage of higher education and academic qualifications.

Attitudes to some aspects of equality

Three important demands which are made by those in favour of equality for women as workers are equal pay (or the rate for the job), more appointments of women to senior posts and more training of women for skilled work. The attitudes of formulators and implementers towards these aspects of equality may also provide some pointers to the spirit in which anti-discriminatory measures may be received at management level.

Very few formulators or implementers (1.8% and 4.7% respectively) express outright opposition to equal pay. 75.8% and 81.9% respectively say they are in favour, but many have serious reservations, the one most often mentioned being that women would find it harder to get jobs as a consequence. The people who give this answer come almost exclusively from manufacturing industries. Many differences, whether between formulators and implementers in the same sample groups or between different groups of formulators and implementers, are not statistically significant. A not unexpected finding is that the percentages of formulators and implementers in favour of equal pay decrease steadily with increasing numbers of women employees. In establishments where equal pay has been introduced both formulators and implementers are more likely to be in favour, the difference being more marked in the case of implementers.

When asked a direct question informants may be reluctant to admit to an opinion which they believe to be unpopular, but will ascribe that opinion to people similar to themselves if asked a question about such people. Formulators were asked how their men colleagues feel about equal pay and it is noteworthy that the views ascribed to their men colleagues are a good deal less favourable than those of the formulators themselves. Only 34.1% are said to be in favour and 11.6% are said to be opposed. It appears likely, therefore, that the attitude of management towards equal pay is less favourable than might be assumed from the expressed opinions of formulators and implementers.

When asked what, in their opinion, are the reasons why so few women rise to senior positions or do skilled work, both formulators and implementers are more likely to attribute the cause to women themselves than to blame other factors. 39.3% of formulators and 36.5% of implementers say that woman are not career-conscious and 25.5% and 23.3% respectively that the break in many women's working lives retards progress. 21.2% and 14.8% respectively blame tradition or the attitude of society.

Only minorities of formulators (41.5%) and implementers (46.3%) think it would be a good thing if more women occupied senior posts. This is evidently a more stringent test of attitudes to equality than is the question of equal pay.

Roughly two-thirds of formulators and implementers think it would be a good thing if more women were trained for highly skilled work.

26.2% of formulators and 32.1% of implementers are in favour of all the three aspects of equality.

The number of women formulators (3) is too small for separate examination. Only 18 implementers are women and therefore it is not always possible to detect significant differences between the attitudes of men and women. However, the percentage of women implementers who are in favour of more women in senior positions (88.9%) is significantly higher than the percentage of men (40.3%).

Although the percentage of women implementers in favour of each aspect of equality is higher than the corresponding percentage of men, only 57.1% of women implementers are in favour of all three. It can therefore be concluded that there are still some women who approve of the present situation, at least in some respects.

Attitudes to their wives' working

95.1% of men formulators and 94.5% of men implementers are married. The percentages of wives who are working (21.3% and 32.3% respectively) are lower than the national average.

Nearly four-fifths of husbands whose wives are working approve of this, in spite of the fact that the jobs done by working wives are for the most part of considerably lower status than those of their husbands.

Ideas for children's futures

Formulators and implementers were asked what sort of careers they would like for those of their children aged 11 or more who are still in full-time education. Majorities of both boys and girls are expected to go on to further education, but the percentage of boys expected to go to university greatly exceed the percentages of girls.

More than half the formulators and implementers would like their children (both boys and girls) to enter one of the professions. For girls, however, this usually means teaching or nursing. No one wants his daughter to become a professional engineer or his son to become a nurse or secretary.

The findings provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that different attitudes towards the careers of boys and girls exist among many parents.

Helping in the home

Only 1.4% of married formulators and 1.5% of married implementers admit to giving their wives no help with domestic tasks. On the other hand only 17.1% and 19.8% claim to do as much as half and for many this is mostly accounted for by their doing most or all of the gardening and household repairs and decorating. Only half of those whose wives are not working but intend to return to work expect to give more help when their wives are working.

In spite of the small number of married women implementers the percentage who say they receive no help at all from their husbands (41.4%) is significantly higher than the percentage of married men implementers who say they give none.

General conclusion

The people on whom the success of anti-discrimination measurers will largely depend are predominantly men, older on average than working men as a whole and of higher educational level. Many of them have inbuilt attitudes towards the roles of the sexes which will, perhaps subconsciously, affect the ways in which they would approach such measures.

CRITERIA USED WHEN ENGAGING EMPLOYEES

Introduction

Questions about the criteria used when engaging staff in different categories were addressed to those implementers who include responsibility for engagement of employees among their duties. 95.2% are responsible for the engagement of at least some categories, but the percentages vary considerably between categories. Practically none of the implementers are responsible only for engaging women, but the percentages who engage men only are, for most categories, not much lower than the percentages who engage both.

Attributes considered important

A "prompt list" of attributes was used. Obviously the attributes considered important vary according to the type of employee being engaged and an attribute such as "educational level" means different things when applied to, say, a scientist and an apprentice.

However, "previous experience" is the leading attribute for all groups of workers except apprentices and unskilled workers. This is something which women are unlikely to possess in the case of many senior and skilled jobs.

Taken over all the categories previous experience is followed by "training", another attribute which women are likely to lack.

The diversity of attributes between categories does not lend itself to summarisation. There is, however, one striking and important finding which can be summarised in a single sentence. Taken over all categories, for every single attribute the percentage who think it is more likely to be found in men is considerably greater than the percentage who think it is more likely to be found in women, and, except for maturity, than the percentage who think it is equally likely to be found in either sex. When we asked whether they would choose a man or a woman if they had identical attributes, the only job for which a majority would choose a woman is catering or domestic work.

General conclusion

This is one of the most forceful examples of inbuilt prejudice which the survey reveals. A majority of those responsible for the engagement of employees start off with the belief that a woman applicant is likely to be inferior to a man in respect of all the qualities considered important.

PROCEDURE FOR FILLING SENIOR POSTS

Introduction

There is uncontrovertible evidence that there are very few women in senior positons in most industries. There is also evidence that few women receive the kinds of education or training, or have had the experience that would qualify them for many such posts. In order to find out whether the ways in which appointments are made constitute a further obstacle we investigated the procedures used for filling four kinds of posts: senior managerial; office supervisory, works supervisory; sales supervisory.

Procedure

Many formulators say that more than one procedure may be used depending on circumstances. Apart from sales supervisory posts, which do not exist in all establishments, roughly two-thirds make promotions within the establishment. If we take into account promotions within the *firm* (i.e. where the establishment is part of a larger organisation) roughly four-fifths make promotions. A little over two-fifths may appoint from outside in the case of senior managerial and office supervisory posts: the proportion is a little lower in the case of works supervisory posts.

Promotions within the establishment are less likely to be made where there are 250 or more women employees or 50% or more women.

Most of the procedures described by those who promote within the establishment or firm show that the final selection is made by "management". Comparatively few organisations apparently have a system of staff appraisal and development.

Except in the case of works supervisory staff, comparatively few of those who make internal promotions say categorically that a woman would not be considered (although in some instances it is said that her pay or conditions would be inferior). Similarly, only a minority of those who make appointments from outside specify that applicants must be men.

It is interesting that, according to formulators, a woman would be more likely to be considered for a senior management post than for a works supervisory post.

General conclusion

A few managements openly admit that they would not consider women for senior appointments even if suitably qualified, but many express doubts that suitably qualified women are to be found.

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Introduction

There are a number of aspects of employee performance which are common to all jobs. The views of management about the relative merits of the sexes in respect of these attributes have important implications for the success or otherwise of anti-discrimination measures.

The attitudes of formulators and implementers were investigated by means of a series of questions. Some of these asked for comparisons between the sexes in respect of a number of attributes common to all jobs, others for within-sex comparisons of different kinds of employees. Answers to questions such as these do not give absolute standards: saying that one sex is better than the other does not necessarily mean that the other is bad - or that the better one is good.

Comparison of job performance of men and women

The aspects covered were: being punctual; working hard; working conscientiously; *not* taking days off for sickness; *not* taking days off for other reasons; staying with one firm; carrying out instructions; working safely.

In most cases the biggest single group consists of those who say there is no difference. The exceptions, in all of which the biggest group think men are better than women are: *not* taking days off for sickness; *not* taking days off for other reasons; staying with one firm.

Women receive more favourable mentions than do men in the case of working hard; working conscientiously; carrying out instructions; working safely.

Taken overall, formulators and implementers are more likely to say that the performances of the sexes are on a par with one another than to favour one sex.

The views of formulators and implementers follow much the same pattern, but on the whole formulators' opinions of women's performance are more favourable than those of implementers.

When asked whether there are any other ways in which the performance of one sex is better than that of the other, both formulators and implementers name more ways in which women excel than in which men excel. The leading answer in respect of women, however, is that they are better at dull, repetitive work, which is not entirely encouraging to those who wish to see women admitted to more skilled and interesting jobs.

Sickness absence

Evidence exists from other sources that sickness absence is more closely related to the grade of worker than to sex.

Formulators and implementers were therefore asked first whether any *kinds* of worker (not sex) are more liable than others to sickness absence. Roughly three-fifths of each are unable to name any specific kinds of worker and mentions of individual types are too few to be meaningful. Taking all types together, within types women are more likely than men to be considered worse in this respect. (Roughly half the formulators and implementers say no records of sickness absence are kept, so many answers must be based on impressions rather than hard facts.)

Within-sex comparisons of job performance

Within-sex comparisons were limited to: working hard; staying with one firm; *not* taking days off for sickness; *not* taking days off for other reasons.

In almost every comparison the kind of worker considered better in respect of one of these aspects is also considered better in all the other aspects.

In almost every instance the percentage who say there is no difference between two kinds of worker of the same sex is lower than the percentage who say there is no difference between the sexes. In other words, managements' expressed opinions indicate an awareness among some that within-sex differences may be greater than between-sex differences.

Taking all four aspects into account, older workers (both men and women) are considered better than younger, married than single, and, particularly, skilled women than unskilled.

Turnover among women employees

We have shown that management opinion tends to regard women as less stable employees. In order to find out what this means in absolute terms implementers were asked to estimate the percentage annual turnover among women employees.

The median estimated annual turnover for all establishments is 14.4% and the mean is 18.2%.

25.5% of implementers estimate the annual turnover at less than 5%.

As in the case of sickness records, many answers here are based on impressions rather than records.

While there are considerable variations within the sample groups, the median exceeds 20% and the mean 25% in only two, the Southern region and establishments with 250 or more women.

The findings here do not lead to the conclusion that all women workers are unstable employees.

General conclusion

The majority opinion of management as expressed by formulators and implementers can be summed up as being that the overall job performance of men and women can be regarded as about equal. Within-sex differences are accepted as being as great as, in some cases greater than, those between men and women.

EFFECT ON PERFORMANCE OF FACILITIES PROVIDED

Introduction

Formulators and implementers were asked which of a number of facilities are provided at the establishment and which of these they believe to be most effective in improving the performance of men and women. The facilities were: part-time work; flexible hours; opportunities for shopping; child care facilities; paid maternity leave; job guarantee after maternity; training for better jobs; paid sick leave.

The object of the question was to attempt to find out whether the provison of facilities, in addition to contributing to the welfare of employees, is also valuable to the employer by virtue of the improved performance which results.

Effects

In the event, for reasons explained in the text, the question did not produce the kind of answers which would enable quantitative estimates to be made. The comparative effectiveness of any facility depends both on the extent to which it is provided and also on the extent to which other facilities are provided. The possible combinations are almost numberless, so comparisons are not feasible.

Rather more than one-quarter of formulators and a little more than one-fifth of implementers think none of these facilities have any effect on performance. The figures are almost the same for men and women. This can be regarded as a positive finding, in the sense that it shows the proportion of employers who regard such facilities more in the light of a welfare measure, but it does not take into account their opinions of the possible effects of facilities which are not provided by their establishments.

In very general terms it can be said that training receives the highest number of mentions as an improver of performance, more so in the case of men than of women (possibly because more men than women receive training).

Part-time work and flexible hours receive appreciable percentages of mentions in the case of women, but few in the case of men, possibly because in this case they apply mainly to women part-timers.

General conclusion

The only conclusion possible is that some managements accept that employee performance can be improved by the provision of facilities.

PENSIONS

Introduction

Existing evidence shows that the percentage of men workers covered by occupational pensions schemes greatly exceeds the percentage of women. Our investigation covered the extent to which schemes are provided and the differences, if any, between the conditions for men and women (the latter was not covered in the case of joint formulator-implementers).

It must be borne in mind that the survey covered only selected industries and its findings are not universally applicable.

Extent to which schemes are provided for men and women

Nearly all the establishments (92.8%) have pensions schemes for any employees.

Comparatively few of the schemes about which information was obtained (about half) (14.2%) are explicitly confined to men only, but the exclusion of women is implicit in schemes which are provided for particular categories of employees in which few, if any, women are employed.

Conditions of schemes

In 16.5% of schemes about which information was obtained there are said to be no differences in men's and women's conditions. 62.8% of these have a different retirement age for men and women. 30.8% have different admission conditions.

The different State retirement age is blamed for the differences in half the schemes where these exist. In only 1.5% is women's greater longevity mentioned.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR WOMEN WORKERS

Introduction

If women are to combine paid employment with domestic responsibilities it has to be recognised that they will encounter special difficulties.

Here we deal primarily with problems which apply only to women, namely, maternity provisions, retraining on return to work, provision when children are ill.

Extent of women's responsibilities

Very many implementers are ignorant of the extent of the family responsibilities of the women who work at their establishments. From the answers of those who are able to make an estimate it can be deduced that, in about four-fifths of establishments half or more of the full-timers and rather more of the part-timers are married. However, the percentages of implementers who are unable to say what percentages of women have children makes a reliable estimate impossible. It would seem that many implementers are unaware of the extent of the family responsibilities of their women employees. Probably they are equally ignorant about men. (Evidence from other sources indicates that about one-fifth of full-time working women and over one-half of the part-timers have children under 16).

Maternity leave

Paid maternity leave is available for any women in 10.6% of establishments. There are no arrangements in nearly two-thirds of establishments. Unpaid leave is granted in 8.6%.

23.4% have "informal arrangements", which appear to be made mainly on an ad hoc basis. It seems that pregnancy can be used as a reason in some cases for dismissing an employee who is not regarded as satisfactory.

Women are more likely to retain rights to seniority, sick pay and pension in establishments which have formal arrangements for maternity leave, whether paid or unpaid.

Retraining

In one quarter of establishments a woman returning after some years' absence is treated exactly as a new entrant.

In only a little over one-third is there any kind of positive approach to re-entrants.

The situation in respect of re-entrants is particularly less favourable than average in larger establishments and the food etc. manufacturing industry.

When children are ill

One-fifth of establishments have a formal policy for time off when children are ill, but only 2.9% grant paid leave.

There is no evidence that time off is ever actually refused.

General conclusion

Only a minority of employers make special arrangements to take account of the different pattern of women's working lives.

WORKING HOURS

Introduction

It is sometimes argued that the legal restrictions on women's working hours make women less useful employees than men, irrespective of their abilities. Because implementers are more directly concerned with the practical running of the establishment, they were asked about legal difficulties and also about the actual hours worked, including overtime and shift working, by men and women. Legal restrictions on women's working hours apply almost entirely to manufacturing industries. The following paragraphs should be read in this light.

Effects of legislation

12.2% of all implementers say that statutory restrictions cause difficulties in employing women to the best advantage. Virtually all of these (97.0%) are in manufacturing industries. Putting it another way, 18.0% of implementers in manufacturing industries find difficulties, compared with 1.0% in other industries. (Most of the trade union opposition to relaxation of legal restrictions comes from unions representing women manual workers in manufacturing industries.)

Working hours and overtime

As shown elsewhere there are considerable differences in the extent to which women are employed at all in certain categories of jobs. Where both men and women are employed full-time on the same work, in 91.9% of non-manual categories and in 87.1% of manual categories their basic hours are the same.

Regular paid overtime is far more a feature of manual than of non-manual jobs: it exists in 64.1% of the former, compared with 30.6% of the latter. (These figures do not, of course, represent the percentages of *employees* in a category who work overtime.) Where overtime is available in jobs where both men and women are employed it is much more usual for both men and women to work overtime than for men only or for women only to do so (the latter is very rare indeed).

All the manual and nearly all the non-manual categories in which regular overtime is worked have a basic working week of 36 or more hours for both men and women. Those who work regular overtime must therefore have only a limited amount of leisure time, particularly if they have domestic responsibilities.

Shift working

Investigation of shift working was confined to those groups in which both men and women full-timers are employed. Implementers were asked whether any employees in these groups work shifts. Shifts are worked in 41.1% of all establishments. In manufacturing industries the figure is 46.0% and in non-manufacturing 32.1%.

When individual job categories are considered, however, the figures are much lower. Shifts are worked by some employees in 4.8% of non-manual and 15.4% of manual categories. In most categories men are more likely than women to work shifts, but all categories except one include instances of both men and women working shifts. Among semi and unskilled manual workers the percentages where men only work shifts exceed those where both men and women do so.

General conclusion on working hours

Our investigation of working hours and shift working was restricted by considerations of time to categories in which both men and women are employed. For these it can be said that there is little difference in the basic hours or the extent of overtime working by men and women. Shifts are more likely to be worked by at least some men, although there are a number of instances where both men and women work shifts.

Possibly an investigation of jobs on which only men or only women are employed might reveal differences in working hours, but it is noteworthy that when formulators were asked why women are never employed on certain jobs "unsuitable hours" is rarely given as a reason except in the case of transport workers.

PART-TIME WORKERS

Introduction

In Great Britain there is a considerable demand for part-time work particularly by married women. There is also criticism of the comparatively low status of much of the part-time work available and of the exclusion of part-time workers from fringe benefits and promotion rights. Our investigations show the extent to which part-timers are employed, the benefits they enjoy and the attitudes of management towards part-timers. Time prevented as detailed an examination as we would have liked, so some aspects were not covered in depth.

Extent to which part-timers are employed

There were changes in the work force at some establishments between the date of sampling and the date of interview of the implementer (see main body of this report for details) but these are minimal and do not affect general conclusions. Four-fifths of establishments employ part-timers and half of these employ both men and women. Whereas one-sixth of all establishments employ 50 or more women, only 4% employ at least ten men. The extent to which women part-timers are employed increases sharply with increasing total number of women employees: nearly half of establishments with 250 or more women employees employ 50 or more part-timers. Part-timers are most often found among office staff, catering and domestic workers, semi and unskilled manual workers.

It is apparent that there are two types of part-time work. First, there is the type mainly confined to establishments employing very few part-timers, which consists of cleaning and the like and has little or no relationship to the main processes of the establishment. Secondly, where large numbers of part-timers are employed they are usually participating in these main processes.

Benefits enjoyed by part-timers

Part-timers are more likely to be allowed flexibility in the hours worked than are full-timers. Such flexibility is less likely to be permitted in establishments with 50% or more women or in the distributive trade.

In only 17.3% of establishments where part-timers are employed are there any opportunities for them to be promoted. The proportion does not reach as many as three in ten in any of the sample groups, and promotional opportunities are almost entirely confined to office staff and catering workers.

Some part-timers are eligible for pensions schemes in only 13.9% of establishments which employ them. The percentage increases with increasing number and percentage of women employees. By no means are part-timers in all categories eligible.

The percentage of establishments where any part-timers are eligible for sick pay (50.0%) is higher than the percentages eligible for promotion, pensions schemes or training. By no means are part-timers in all categories eligible.

27.5% of establishments which employ part-timers provide training at least for some of them. The percentage which give training is significantly lower in engineering than in other manufacturing industries.

Future plans for employing part-timers

About two-thirds of establishments have considered taking on (more) part-timers. The difference between establishments currently employing part-timers and those not doing so (72.8% compared with 38.8%) is striking. It is apparent that increases in the extent to which part-timers are employed will be more likely to come from firms which already employ them.

Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time workers

The foregoing detailed information about the employment of part-timers was obtained from implementers. Formulators were asked only for their views on the advantages and disadvantages of employing them.

18.3% think there are no advantages, compared with 14.9% who say there are no disadvantages. The average number of disadvantages mentioned exceeds the number of advantages (1.5% compared with 1.2%)

Comparatively few of the advantages and disadvantages mentioned relate to the needs or qualities of the part-timers themselves. The leading advantages are: can have them only when you need them; useful, if you can't get full-timers; useful if job doesn't require full-time staff. The leading disadvantages are: lack of continuity; too costly; job requires full-time cover.

General conclusion

It is fair to say that in many establishments part-timers are regarded and treated as second class members of the work force. They are often excluded from fringe benefits and promotion prospects and are taken on according to the requirements of the jobs. There are few indications that part-time workers are likely to achieve equal status.

STEPS TAKEN TOWARDS EQUAL PAY

Introduction

Equal pay is only one aspect of equality at work, but it is a very important one. We therefore investigated the extent to which equal pay already exists, the plans which have been made for its introduction and the effects which it has had or is expected to have.

A word of caution is necessary here. The sample was confined to certain industries and to establishments with 100 or more employees. Industries which were not covered include some where very few women are employed but also include some (national and local government for example) where equal pay exists. Smaller establishments account for a considerable proportion of the female labour force and very small establishments are more likely to have a more haphazard pay structure (unless, of course, they are part of a large organisation).

Extent to which equal pay exists

Equal pay for women doing the same or broadly similar work as men existed at the time of the survey (early 1973) in 34.9% of all establishments. In a further 18.1% formulators say there are no women doing the same work as men. 19.9% have had equal pay for 10 years or more (16.2% have "always had it") and only 4.1% have introduced it in the past two years (i.e. since the passing of the Equal Pay Act).

It exists in 23.4% of establishments in manufacturing industries, compared with 56.7% of those in non-manufacturing industries.

Effects and anticipated effects of equal pay

The actual effects of the introduction of equal pay, as described by formulators from establishments where it has been in force for two years or more, are less far-reaching than those anticipated by formulators from establishments where it has not been introduced. 57.5% of the former say, in answer to an open question that equal pay has had no effects, compared with 21.1% of the latter who anticipate no effects. Because many establishments had had equal pay for a long time their recollections may not be very clear.

None of the formulators who have had equal pay in force for two years or more mention the cost to the firm, compared with 36.0% of the remainder.

When questioned on four specific points (number of women employed, range of jobs on which women are employed, opportunities for promotion and opportunities for training for women) a substantial majority in both groups say there have been or they anticipate no effect. The group where equal pay has been introduced virtually never gives answers unfavourable to women's prospects, whereas such answers are given by fairly substantial minorities of the remainder.

There is some disagreement between different individuals at an establishment about the extent to which equal pay has been introduced.

Trade unions and equal pay

A comparison between establishments where trade unions are recognised and those where they are not shows that there are only minor differences between the extent to which equal pay is in force. It should, however, be remembered that the survey did not cover a number of industries where equal pay is in force and where trade union recognition is almost universal (for example, national and local government, education and a number of others).

General conclusion

Many of the ill-effects prophesied as a result of the introduction of equal pay have not in fact come about in the establishments where it has been introduced at the time of the survey (1973). Many of these, however, have "always had equal pay".

Comparatively few firms had introduced equal pay between the passing of the Equal Pay Act and the time of the survey. This reinforces the view that equality in other directions will not automatically be achieved as the result of legislation.

WAYS IN WHICH WOMEN'S OPPORTUNITIES COULD BE IMPROVED

Introduction

Formulators and implementers were asked what, if anything, could be done by the firm itself, the Government and the trade unions to improve women's employment opportunities.

Suggested courses of action

It is perhaps not surprising that the percentages who believe the firm can do nothing (45.8% of formulators, 54.9% of implementers) greatly exceed the percentages who believe the Government can do nothing (17.5% and 26.5%) or the trade unions can do nothing (13.5% and 23.5%). There is very little discernable pattern in the answers. For example, those groups who are more likely to think the firm can do nothing are not necessarily more likely to think the Government or the trade unions can do something.

The provision of better training facilities for women receives more mentions than any other course of action which could be taken by the firm or by the Government. Roughly one-sixth of formulators and of implementers think the firm should provide these, compared with just over one-fifth who think the Government should do so. This is followed, in the case of the firm by the suggestion that women should be given equal chances of getting jobs and in the case of the Government that it should take steps to change the basic attitudes of society and should make discrimination illegal. Mentions of supporting services, such as child-care facilities, are very few in number.

Criticism of the trade unions is more widespread than that of the firm or the Government. 44.3% of formulators and 31.3% of implementers believe that the unions should accept women on an equal basis and 14.9% and 12.1% respectively think the unions should fight as hard for women's rights as for men's.

When asked whether anything else could be done to improve women's opportunities in general, roughly three-fifths cannot suggest anything. The only suggestion made by as many as one tenth of either is that basic attitudes should be changed.

General conclusion

Representatives of senior management are more likely to expect the necessary steps towards equality for women at work to be taken by the Government or the trade unions than by the firms they represent. They emphasise the need to change the basic attitudes of society.

REACTIONS TO EXPANDING WOMEN'S OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN ESTABLISHMENTS

Introduction

We show elsewhere that, when asked in general terms what could be done to improve women's opportunities in general, both formulators and implementers are more likely to suggest actions to be taken by the Government or the trade unions than those to be taken by their own firms. However, minorities did suggest the firms (as well as the Government) could expand the range of jobs open to women.

Formulators were asked a number of questions about jobs on which men and women are employed at present on the same or broadly similar work, about jobs in which women are never employed and about jobs which formulators think could not be done by the opposite sex. Their answers provide some insight into possible managerial reactions to initiatives designed to open the range of jobs available to women in their own firms or establishments.

The detailed classification of the answers presented some problems, but some general conclusions clearly emerge.

Jobs in which men and women are employed on the same or broadly similar work

In 18.5% of establishments no men or women are engaged on the same or broadly similar work. The percentage is much higher in establishments with less than 10% of women employees (39.8%) and in food manufacturing (40.7%). It is lower in establishments with 10 – 24% of women (7.9%) and in the commerce etc. industrial group (3.1%).

It should be remembered that a job not done by both sexes may be done by men only or women only. In the two groups of occupations common to all establishments, namely managerial and clerical, it is probable that, where the same job is not done by both sexes, in management jobs it is mostly done by men only whereas in clerical jobs it is done by women only.

Managerial jobs are more likely to be done by both men and women in establishments with 250 or more women employees. The implication here is that it is common for men to supervise women, but uncommon for women to supervise men.

It is in the clerical group of occupations that the extent of overlap is greatest. Variations between different kinds of establishment are much less than in the case of managerial occupations.

Where training is provided for jobs on which both men and women are employed it is almost always the same for both sexes. (There are fairly marked variations in the extent to which any training is provided.)

Jobs on which women are never employed

In terms of percentages of establishments which employ workers in a particular category, transport workers come first on the list of those jobs in which women are never employed (89.0%). In terms of all establishments skilled manual workers come first (63.1%) followed by managers (46.8%). All establishments employ office staff and only .8% never employ women.

In establishments where the formulator is in favour of equal pay, where he is a non-discriminator and where equal pay has been introduced the percentages which never employ women in three senior categories (managers, supervisors, scientists) are higher than where the reverse is the case.

Among establishments with over 50% of women employees, over one-quarter never employ women managers.

The most striking features among manual workers are the high percentages which never employ women as skilled workers and as apprentices and the much lower percentages which never employ them as semi-skilled or unskilled manual workers.

In the case of every non-manual occupation in which women are never employed, over half the formulators give as the reason "has always been a man's job". On prompting, the most important reason is that women have not the appropriate qualifications or skills.

Looking at the reasons given in respect of non-manual occupations in general it can be said that the two biggest obstacles to appointing women to posts of this kind are the "traditionalist" approach and lack of skills and qualifications for which many women have never had the chance to train.

The traditionalist approach is also in evidence in the case of manual jobs, particularly skilled work. The physical demands of the job are also mentioned. It is fair to comment that women in fact did many of the skilled jobs during the Second World War and that some of the semi and unskilled work which is done by women, often in the same workshop, is equally demanding.

Lack of qualifications or skills is also frequently mentioned, even in the case of apprentices, who are in fact in the process of acquiring skills.

Union objections and those of other workers are of greater importance in the case of manual than of non-manual occupations. It is noteworthy that there are very few mentions of legal restrictions on women's hours and conditions.

When those who had mentioned lack of qualifications were asked whether a suitably qualified woman would be considered, an appreciable proportion of them (more than half in the case of foremen and apprentices) said she would not. This is particularly disquieting so far as apprentices are concerned, because it indicates that there will be a reluctance on the part of many managements to give girls the chance to acquire the skills without which they cannot aspire to many senior posts.

Jobs which cannot be done by the opposite sex

62.4% of formulators think there are jobs in the establishment which *no* woman could do, compared with 14.4% who think there are jobs which *no* man could do. The range of jobs named was very much wider for women than for men.

A comparison of the answers in respect of men and women show that very different criteria are applied. Many jobs which men are said to be unable to do are such that a man might lose face by doing them. Women, however, are believed to be physically incapable of some of them (although, as already said, many of these jobs are no more demanding physically than many jobs already done by women). The traditionalist approach is also in evidence. Comparatively few mention lack of skills or qualifications: roughly two-thirds of those who give this answer think women could be trained.

When asked whether jobs could be modified so that they could be done by women in three-quarters of instances formulators say they could not.

General conclusion

It is apparent from these findings that the application of the principle of equal opportunity is likely to meet with considerable opposition in practice. There is evidence of a fairly widespread traditionalist attitude, which covers not only comparatively senior jobs but also extends to apprenticeships. Without a more detailed examination of the precise nature of the physical and other attributes required for jobs, it is not possible to say how much of the opposition has a reasonable basis. In a paper published in November 1974, (1), Dr. King shows that for most jobs, whatever the attributes required, there will be some men and women capable of performing them.

EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND TRADE UNIONS

Introduction

Questions were asked about employers' associations and trade unions in order to find out how far modifications in women's working conditions are likely to be determined solely by individual management.

Membership of employers' associations

Two-thirds of establishments are members of employers' associations. The proportion is higher in manufacturing industries.

Trade union recognition

Trade unions are recognised in 84.6% of establishments. They are less likely to be recognised in smaller establishments, those with 50% or more of women employees and in the distribution industry.

Negotiating with trade unions

29.2% of formulators and 21.9% of implementers are personally involved in negotiations with trade unions on the question of women's wages and salaries.

General conclusion

Modifications to women's working conditions are likely in a majority of establishments to be influenced by bodies other than the management of the establishment.

---

(1) Sex Differences and Society, by Dr King *Department of Employment Manpower Paper* No. 10.

Chapter VI Status and duties of formulators and implementers

Introduction

In order to obtain some measure of the status and probable influence of the people responsible for formulating and implementing personnel policy, informants were asked what posts they held and to whom they were responsible.

Implementers were also asked to describe their duties briefly. As well as giving an idea of the extent to which personnel functions are combined with other duties this question made it possible to identify those implementers who are directly responsible for engaging staff in some, if not all, categories.

Posts held by formulators and implementers

The posts held by the formulators and implementers are as follows:

	Formulators	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Women*
(unweighted bases)	*(212)*	*(222)*	*(204)*	*(18)*
Post held	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
Chairman, managing director	15.9	7.6	8.6	(–)
Personnel director	5.2	1.3	1.4	(–)
Other director	21.6	16.1	18.2	(–)
General manager	17.5	9.4	10.6	(–)
Personnel manager, officer	17.2	26.3	17.6	(57.1)
Manager or head of department	16.1	19.9	4.5	(38.1)
Responsible for personnel and/or training and/or welfare matters	–	5.8	6.1	(3.2)
Company secretary	–	4.0	4.5	(–)
Other descriptions	6.6	9.6	10.6	(1.6)

As only to be expected (by virtue of the definitions) this table shows that the average level of the posts held by implementers is lower than that of those held by formulators. It also shows that the status of the posts held by women implementers is, on average, much lower than that of men's posts. Not one woman implementer holds a director's or general manager's post. It is reasonable to conclude that women implementers are likely to be less influential than men so far as personnel policy is concerned.

The percentage of formulators who are chairmen or managing directors is significantly higher among those whose education finished at age 19 or later (39.6%, compared with 2.8% of those whose education finished at age 15 or earlier). It decreases with increasing numbers of employees, apparently because the larger establishments are more likely to have a director solely responsible for personnel. Industrial differences are quite marked, as follows:

	% of formulators who are:	
	Chairman &/or managing directors	*Other directors*
Industrial group	*%*	*%*
Food, etc. manufacturing	1.7	20.4
Engineering	22.2	35.8
Textiles, clothing	20.6	34.6
Transport & communications	(1.4)	(8.7)
Commerce	(20.3)	(9.4)
Distribution	(14.8)	(31.5)

The numbers are small but the difference between food manufacturing and other manufacturing is statistically significant. The transport and communications group includes a number of public bodies, which explains the lower figures here.

Among implementers differences in status are less marked than among formulators, but the difference between food manufacturing and the rest of manufacturing industry persists.

It is difficult to generalise, because the status difference may be more apparent than real: a chairman who combines other functions with those of personnel policy may in fact exert less influence than a personnel director who devotes all his time to this one aspect of management. Higher status may also imply greater remoteness from the day-to-day problems which crop up when policy is implemented.

The persons or bodies to whom formulators and implementers are responsible are as follows:

	Formulators	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Women*
	%	%	%	%
To whom responsible				
Chairman, vice chairman	12.2	5.8	6.4	(–)
Managing director	27.9	24.5	27.6	(–)
Board of directors	35.2	28.1	29.0	(20.6)
Total responsible to board level	75.3	58.4	63.0	(20.6)
General manager	4.1	8.9	6.7	(25.4)
Head of department	7.9	13.2	8.6	(49.2)
Other person or body	12.7	19.4	21.6	(4.8)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(The inclusion of some public bodies in the sample explains the comparatively high percentage of "other" persons or bodies. It is not possible to be more specific without violating the confidentiality of our informants' identities.)

Elsewhere we compare in detail the people who combine the functions of formulator and implementer (about half the total sample of each). The indications of that comparison are that the above figures understate the difference in levels between formulators and implementers.

The person or body to whom a formulator or implementer is directly responsible may possibly be a better guide to the importance of the job than is the title given to the job itself.

The percentage of women implementers who are responsible to someone at board level is significantly lower than that of men implementers. It is evident that women implementers on average have a lower position in the management hierarchy than do their male counterparts, nearly half of them being responsible to a departmental head.

In the following table we compare the percentages of formulators and implementers in each of the sample groups who are *directly responsible to a chairman, managing director or board of directors.*

		Formulators	*Implementer*
		%	%
All informants		75.3	58.4
Attitude to E.P.	For	78.0	59.3
	Others	67.7	54.0
Discrimination index	For all three aspects	72.5	50.6
	For any two	73.5	48.8
	For any one	74.8	64.7
	For none	(93.0)	(24.2)
Total number of employees	249 or less	77.2	61.0
	250-499	69.2	52.9
	500 or more	77.1	57.6
Number of women	99 or less	75.5	59.9
	100-249	78.4	59.8
	250 or more	64.4	48.4
Percentage of women	9% or less	78.8	46.4
	10-24%	83.6	77.2
	25-49%	78.0	69.7
	50% and over	67.9	49.1
E.P. introduced	Yes	61.4	49.0
	No	82.7	62.2
	None doing same work	82.6	66.4
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	71.0	45.9
	Engineering etc.	84.7	79.4
	Textiles, clothing	80.6	70.8
	Transport & communications	(43.5)*	(13.3)*
	Commerce etc.	(67.2)	(45.3)
	Distribution	(81.5)	(64.8)
Broad region	Central	90.8	73.9
	Northern	65.5	46.4
	Southern	80.5	70.4

*The percentage of public bodies included in this group is higher than in others, hence the comparatively low percentages responsible to boards of directors etc.

As a general rule the status of implementers follows the same pattern as that of formulators. Where there are exceptions the differences are not very great, except in the case of establishments employing less than 10% of women.

Nature of implementers' jobs

The implementation of personnel policy can cover a wide variety of duties. It can also form only part of the implementers' job. Implementers were therefore asked:

> 'Can you please tell me exactly what your job consists of?'

Their unprompted answers are as follows:

Duties	*All implementers*
Recruitment	46.7
Supervising whole of establishment	39.1
Dealing with matters relating to salaries	26.7
Organisation of training	21.3
Industrial relations	18.5
Responsible for health matters	16.3
Dealing with personnel problems of staff	11.1
Safety	9.7
Manpower planning	9.7
Maintenance of records	9.7
Running canteen, catering	7.8
Cleanliness of establishment	5.6
Social side of welfare	5.3
Administration of fringe benefits	5.3
Other specific duties	40.7
'Personnel matters' (unspecified)	25.5
'Welfare matters' (unspecified)	14.5

The above figures probably understate the range of duties undertaken by implementers. Because we wished to ask a number of questions about recruitment a check question was asked of those who had not mentioned recruitment as one of their duties. In response to this a further 48.5% said it is one of their duties. It therefore seems likely that prompting in respect of other duties would have produced additional mentions.

Detailed comparisons between groups would not be justified because of this probable understatement. What can be said is that many implementers have the power to exert considerable day-to-day influence on the working lives of women, possibly even more so than their own descriptions of their duties would indicate.

Chapter VII Background information

Introduction

Formulators and implementers were asked a number of questions about their own background and families.

The object of these questions was threefold. In the first place it was considered desirable to find out the characteristics of the people who will be mainly responsible for carrying out any policies of non-discrimination which may be introduced through legislation. These are the people who will have to be convinced of the necessity and desirability of non-discrimination.

Secondly some of their basic attitudes to equality of the sexes which would not be revealed by direct questioning might, it was considered, make themselves manifest in the answers given to questions about their children's careers and their views about their own wives' working.

Thirdly, a knowledge of characteristics such as education and training gives some idea of the likelihood that an appreciable number of women may reach such positions in the foreseeable future.

Sex

In absolute numbers there were only 3 women formulators and 18 implementers. After weighting this gives 2.0% of formulators and 11.5% of implementers. It should be remembered that the definitions of both included the words "for women" and therefore it can justly be said that non-discrimination for women will almost entirely depend at management level on the goodwill of men.

This finding is also very revealing in the light of the fact that 38.5%(1) of the employees in Great Britain are females (i.e. women or girls).

Some differences between the attitudes or characteristics of the sexes are more usefully shown in the appropriate paragraphs of this section. For others the picture emerges more clearly by taking a number of comparisons together; this we do here. The following compares the sex composition of implementers with different attitudes towards the three important aspects of equality.

		For E.P.	*Not For E.P.*	*For women in senior positions*	*Not*	*For more training for women*	*Not*
	%	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
Sex							
Men	88.5	87.3	93.9	77.9	97.7	88.3	88.9
Women	11.5	12.7	6.1	22.1	2.3	11.7	11.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The differences are not, perhaps, as great as might have been expected, particularly that between those for and against more training for women. The difference is significant in the case of those for and not for more women in senior positions.

---

(1) Source: *Department of Employment Gazette* August 1973.

It is noteworthy that only 3.9% of implementers in establishments where equal pay has not been introduced are women, compared with 20.0% where it has been introduced and 18.2% where no women are doing the same work as men. The difference between the non-equal pay establishments and the remainder is significant. It is reasonable to assume that, in establishments with equal pay women are more likely to be considered for promotion to senior positions. For those where no women are doing the same work as men it is more difficult to find an explanation, except possibly that it is more likely that there are different implementers of policy for men and women.

The following columns give:

a) percentages of *all implementers in a group* who are women

b) percentages of *all establishments* which come into each group

c) percentages of *all men implementers* who come into each group

d) percentages of *all women implementers* who come into each group (these should be treated with reserve)

		(a) %	*(b)* %	*(c)* %	*(d)* %
All establishments		11.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total no. of employees	249 or less	10.5	57.1	57.7	(52.4)
	250-499	16.9	24.8	23.3	(36.5)
	500 & more	7.1	18.4	19.0	(11.1)
Total no. of women	99 or less	5.3	55.1	59.0	(25.4)
	100-249	19.5	33.6	30.5	(57.1)
	250 or more	17.7	11.3	10.5	(17.5)
Percentage of women	9% or less	5.3	55.1	59.0	(25.4)
	10-24%	1.6	22.4	24.3	(3.2)
	25-49%	5.1	18.1	19.6	(7.9)
	50% & over	25.9	39.4	33.9	(88.9)
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	23.0	11.0	9.6	(22.2)
	Engineering etc.	2.4	23.0	25.4	(4.8)
	Textiles, clothing	7.0	31.0	32.5	(19.0)
	Transp. & commun.	16.0	13.6	12.9	(19.0)
	Commerce etc.	25.0	11.6	9.8	(25.4)
	Distribution	11.1	9.8	9.8	(9.5)
Broad region	Central	6.7	25.2	28.0	(3.2)
	Northern	13.6	53.8	50.3	(80.9)
	Southern	11.5	21.0	21.7	(15.9)

It can be seen from column (a) that even in establishments where women predominate the great majority of implementers are men. The percentage of women implementers rises steadily with increasing percentage of women employees, but even at its maximum (in establishments where 50% or more of the employees are women) does not reach as high as one-third.

The differences between industries in the percentages of implementers who are women are quite marked, although some of the individual differences are not statistically significant. That between engineering and the remainder is significant.

Age

We first compare the ages of formulators with those of all implementers and of men and women implementers.

Age group	*All formulators*	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Wome*
		%	%	%
39 and under	22.9	21.9	23.1	12.7
40-54	61.6	53.7	52.4	63.5
55 and over	15.1	23.9	23.9	23.8
Not stated	.4	.5	.6	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The average age of implementers as a whole is slightly higher than that of formulators. The difference between men and women implementers is not significant.

The age compositions of the male and female populations between the ages of 15 and 64 are given below, together with the age composition of working women as found in the Women's Employment survey.

Age group	*Male population*	*Female population*	*Working wome*
	%	%	%
15–39	53.5	51.5	48.3
40–54	28.9	29.2	36.7
55–64	17.6	19.3	14.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

For practical purposes the male population between 15 and 64 can be taken as representing the male working population.

Both formulators and men implementers include a much lower proportion of those under 40 than there is in the male population as a whole. The same is true of women implementers as compared with working women as a whole. This is not surprising because most formulators and implementers hold fairly senior positions which are unlikely to be reached by many men (or women) in the lower age groups.

In the following table we compare the ages of formulators and implementers who have different attitudes to the three main aspects of equality.

		Equal pay		*Senior positions*		*More training*	
	Total	*In favour*	*Others*	*In favour*	*Others*	*In favour*	*Others*
Age of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
39 and under	22.9	21.4	27.5	20.9	24.3	17.2	33.7
40–54	61.6	62.5	58.8	60.9	62.1	69.8	46.0
55 and over	15.1	15.8	13.0	18.2	12.9	13.0	19.2
Not stated	.4	.2	.7	1.3	.6	–	1.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Age of implementers							
39 and under	21.9	18.5	37.4	23.6	20.4	24.0	17.7
40–54	53.7	58.4	32.3	48.8	57.8	52.6	55.8
55 and over	23.9	22.9	28.3	27.6	20.7	23.2	25.4
Not stated	.5	.2	2.0	–	1.0	.3	1.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Among formulators of policy those not in favour of each of the three aspects of equality include higher percentages of the under 40 age group, this being particularly marked among those not in favour of more training for women. One is tempted to say the younger formulators will learn better as they grow older. A possible explanation is that younger men foresee more intense competition for desirable jobs if women are trained and given the opportunity to fill such jobs. It would not augur well for progress towards non-discrimination if the formulators of the future are more opposed to equality than those of the present day.

Among implementers there is no such consistency. Although non-supporters of equal pay include a higher percentage of younger implementers, the reverse is true of non-supporters of training for women.

(We show elsewhere that among the very small number of formulators and implementers aged under 30, very high proportions are in favour of all aspects of equality).

Terminal educational age

The ages at which full-time education finished are as follows for formulators, all implementers, men implementers and women implementers.

	All formulators	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Women*
	%	%	%	%
Terminal education age				
15 and under	26.4	42.3	40.0	60.3
16–18	51.3	43.8	44.5	38.1
19 and over	21.4	13.1	14.6	1.6
Not stated	.9	.7	.8	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The following terminal education ages for all men and all women who have finished their full-time education are obtained from the *General Household Survey*(1) for 1972. The figures for all working women and for women in managerial positions are obtained from the Women's Employment Survey and relate to 1965.

	All men	*All women*	*Working women*	*Women in managerial jobs*
	%	%	%	%
Terminal education age				
15 and under	71.6	73.6	75.1	46.8
16–18	19.5	19.6	19.8	28.7
19 and over	8.1	5.9	3.7	19.4
Not stated	.8	.9	1.4	5.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

By the criterion of terminal education age, formulators and men implementers on average have a higher educational level than the male population as a whole, the difference being less marked in the case of implementers. The average educational level of women implementers is lower than that of men. It is not nearly as high as that of women in managerial posts found in the earlier survey. The latter may be because the present survey excludes a number of industries which demand a higher educational level for people in posts classed as managerial (national and local government, health service, teaching, for example) and which also attract more highly qualified women.

It is also useful to compare the educational levels of formulators and implementers with different attitudes to aspects of equality.

(1) The G.H.S. is a large-scale survey carried out by the Social Survey Division of O.P.C.S., covering a wide range of subjects.

Age at which full-time education finished	*Equal pay*			*Senior positions*		*More training*	
	Total %	*In favour* %	*Others* %	*In favour* %	*Others* %	*In favour* %	*Othe* %
Formulators							
15 or under	26.4	29.4	16.8	28.4	24.9	25.9	27.3
16–18	51.3	46.5	66.4	48.4	53.3	58.0	38.5
19 or over	21.4	23.1	16.0	21.8	21.1	16.1	31.6
Not stated	.9	1.0	.8	1.3	.6	–	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Age at which full-time education finished	*Equal pay*			*Senior positions*		*More training*	
	Total %	*In favour* %	*Others* %	*In favour* %	*Others* %	*In favour* %	*Other* %
Implementers							
15 or under	42.3	42.5	41.4	40.9	45.3	44.9	40.1
16–18	43.8	44.5	40.4	51.0	29.3	47.2	40.8
19 or over	13.1	12.7	15.2	7.6	24.3	7.9	17.7
Not stated	.7	.2	3.0	.5	1.1	–	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

There is less consistency in the findings in respect of terminal education age than in the case of age. Differences between those in favour of equal pay and the remainder, and between those in favour and those not in favour of more women in senior positions are not significant and are not all in the same direction. In the case of training, however, t percentages of the more highly educated among those in favour and those not in favour of more training for women are significantly different. The higher percentage of more highly educated among those not in favour of more training for women may arise from a conscious or subconscious fear of fiercer competition if more women are trained.

Examinations passed by formulators and implementers

Details of the examinations passed by formulators and men and women implementers (apart from their schools' own examinations) are as follows:

Examinations passed	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* *All* %	*Men* %	*Women* %
None	13.3	24.0	20.2	52.4
University degree, Dip. Tech.	18.9	9.5	9.8	6.3
HNC, HND	12.2	8.3	9.4	–
ONC	13.5	6.8	7.8	–
City and Guilds	7.7	8.2	9.2	–
GCE A or S level or equivalent	28.4	14.4	15.1	7.9
GCE 0 level	13.8	13.9	15.1	4.8
Matriculation, GSC	33.0	27.0	27.2	25.4
RSA, CSE	3.0	6.5	6.3	7.9
Professional examinations	30.4	20.9	22.3	9.5
Commercial examinations	1.3	7.6	7.4	9.5
Others	13.5	11.8	13.1	1.6

These examinations are obviously not mutually exclusive; in fact, to have passed certain higher level examinations one must have passed some lower level ones. The main differences between formulators and implementers as a whole and between men and women implementers can be discerned in the percentages who have passed higher level examinations (degree, HNC, HND and professional examinations) and in the percentages who have passed no examinations at all. The great majority of GCE O level passes were in several subjects: 13.6% of formulators and 13.0% of implementers had passed in 5 or more subjects.

In the earlier Women's Employment Survey it was found that roughly half the women in managerial occupations had passed no examinations, so in this respect women implementers do not differ from women in senior positions as a whole in industry. Among all working women in the earlier survey only about one in five had passed any examinations. Women implementers on average are therefore more highly qualified than the generality of working women but less highly qualified than their male counterparts.

There are some variations among the groups in the extent to which formulators and implementers have passed any examinations at all, but the only ones of any significance are, first, that in the transport group the percentages of formulators and implementers with no such qualifications are higher than in any other industry (36.2% of formulators, 46.7% of implementers) and second, that as might be expected the percentage having passed no examinations is higher among those whose full-time education finished at age 15 or earlier (31.9% among formulators, 37.8% among implementers).

There are marked variations in the percentages who have passed examinations of degree standard and of those whose full-time education finished at 19 or later. It is almost impossible to summarise these in an intelligible way, so the details are given in full in the following table.

		*Qualification of degree standard**		*F/T education finished at age 19 or later*	
		Formulators	*Implementers*	*Formulators*	*Implementers*
		%	%	%	%
All		31.0	17.7	21.4	13.1
Age of informant	39 and under	39.5	41.7	29.0	24.2
	40–54	31.4	11.9	20.1	9.6
	55 and over	17.1	9.2	15.9	1.9
Attitude To E.P.	For	28.0	17.1	23.1	10.7
	Others	30.5	20.2	16.0	12.1
Discrimination index	For all three aspects	37.4	17.6	19.0	6.3
	For any two	38.9	18.2	17.1	9.4
	For any one	10.5	15.4	33.6	25.0
	For none	(39.1)	(24.2)	(10.9)	(24.2)
Total no. of employees	249 or less	23.4	8.6	15.5	7.3
	250–499	44.6	27.2	30.8	20.6
	500 or more	37.5	33.3	28.1	21.2
Total no. of women	99 or less	24.8	15.9	22.2	12.6
	100–249	38.6	16.3	16.0	12.5
	250 or more	39.0	30.6	33.9	17.7
Percentage of women	9% or less	26.5	15.5	24.8	26.4
	10–24%	24.1	18.7	26.7	13.0
	25–49%	33.7	27.3	16.3	11.1
	50% or more	35.8	13.9	19.1	7.4
E.P. introduced	Yes	24.3	8.6	15.3	8.1
	No	34.3	28.0	23.1	13.8
	None doing same work	35.7	11.4	28.6	25.0

		*Qualification of degree standard**		*F/T Education finished at age 19 or later*	
		Formulators	*Implementers*	*Formulators*	*Implementers*
		%	%	%	%
Industrial group	Food etc. mfr.	(50.8)	(32.8)	(20.3)	(23.0)
	Engineering	51.1	25.4	36.6	13.5
	Textiles, clothing	19.4	20.2	19.4	15.5
	Transport	(24.6)	(9.3)	(1.4)	(13.3)
	Commerce etc.	(6.3)	(1.6)	(26.6)	(3.1)
	Distribution	(33.3)	(5.6)	(11.1)	(5.6)
Broad region	Central	31.0	21.7	21.1	11.6
	Northern	33.1	16.9	21.6	12.9
	Southern	25.7	14.8	21.2	15.6

*Under the heading of "degree standard" are included university degrees, diploma in technology, HNC and HND. A table showing these separately would have been too cumbersome, but it is worth noting that HNC and HND are almost entirely confined to formulators and implementers in the manufacturing industries and that the percentage having these qualifications is much higher among both formulators and implementers under 40 years of age.

On the basis both of degree standard qualifications and of terminal education age the education levels of younger formulators and implementers are higher than those of older. There is evidence that in recent years there have been more openings in industry for graduates in subjects other than scientific and technological ones and this finding of the survey probably reflects this trend.

Apart from this there is no wholly consistent pattern in the educational levels of the groups. There are even exceptions to the general statement that on average formulators are more highly educated than implementers.

Training received by formulators and implementers

In common with all other informants, formulators and implementers were asked whether they had received any training from their present firm or from any other firms they had worked for, and if so, for what kinds of jobs.

The extent to which they had received training is as follows.

	Formulators	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Women*
Training received:	%	%	%	%
None	18.3	17.9	19.6	4.8
From present firm only	14.8	32.5	32.9	28.6
From other firm(s) only	31.7	25.0	23.7	34.9
From both	35.2	24.6	23.8	31.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of jobs for which trained				
None	18.3	17.9	19.6	4.8
One	23.4	34.4	35.0	30.2
Two	27.3	24.1	20.9	49.2
Three or more	31.0	23.6	24.5	15.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average number of jobs				
per individual	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.9
per person having trained	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.0

The most interesting finding here is that practically all women implementers have received some form of job training. According to evidence from a number of sources only about one working woman in four has received any kind of job training. The difference between women implementers and the generality of working women is much more marked in the case of job training than in the case of educational level.

Variations in the extent to which training has been received are much less than is the case with qualifications and educational level. Those which are worth comment are as follows:

Virtually all the formulators and implementers in the 39 and under age group have received some form of job training. This presumably reflects the development of management training in recent years.

Industrial differences are more marked than others. They are given in full as a matter of interest.

	Training received by :	
	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
ALL	81.7	82.1
Food etc. manufacture	(83.1)	(90.2)
Engineering	80.2	86.6
Textiles	91.5	75.7
Transport and communications	(53.6)	(98.7)
Commerce etc.	(93.7)	(78.1)
Distribution	(75.9)	(64.8)

It is interesting that the industry in which the lowest proportion of formulators have received any job training is that one in which the highest proportion of implementers have done so.

In the following summary of jobs for which formulators and implementers have been trained "duplicate" jobs have been eliminated: that is to say, if training has been received for more than one job in the same CODOT Minor Group, it has been counted once only (it has been counted as training for two jobs in the preceding tables).

Jobs for which trained		*Formulators*	*Implementers*		
			All	*Men*	*Women*
		%	%	%	%
None		18.3	17.9	19.6	4.8
00	General management	11.4	7.8	6.3	19.0
02	Legal and related occupations	.2	–	–	–
03	Company secretarial, accounting etc.	12.7	11.4	12.9	–
04	Personnel management	23.8	28.0	27.4	33.3
05	Marketing, public relations	.2	3.1	3.5	–
06	Professional occupations supporting management	.2	.4	.5	–
09	Teaching, instructing	2.8	6.2	5.7	6.5
10	Social science, welfare	1.3	2.1	2.4	–
11,12	Health occupations	–	1.8	1.4	4.8
15	Literary occupations	–	2.2	2.5	–
17	Performing arts etc.	.2	.2	.2	–
18	Professional sports etc.	.4	.2	.2	–
21,22,23	Natural sciences, engineering etc.	6.1	4.0	4.5	–
24.25	Other related science and technology	7.4	5.6	6.3	–
27	Managerial (industrial operations)	17.7	18.8	18.8	19.0
28	Managerial (services etc.)	10.5	14.9	16.2	4.8

		Formulators	*Implementers*		
			All	*Men*	*Women*
		%	%	%	%
31,32,33,34	Office occupations	6.1	14.1	8.2	60.3
36,37	Selling occupations	1.8	6.7	7.6	–
40	Armed forces occupations	2.2	.9	1.0	–
43,44	Food preparing and serving; personal service	2.2	2.7	2.5	4.8
54	Fibre and textile processing	.2	.7	.2	4.8
61-69	Making and repairing (excluding metal & elect)	.6	.9		
71-79	Processing, making and repairing (metal & elect)	9.6	14.5	13.1	25.4
Other occupations		3.3	1.4	1.0	4.8

Differences between formulators and implementers are for the most part less marked than those between men and women implementers. Of particular significance is the very high proportion of women who have been trained in office jobs. The total of 60.3% is made up of: 22.2% clerical occupations, 28.6% shorthand and typewriting, 9.6% office machine and telecommunications operating. It seems that the road to more senior positions is much more likely to start from an office for women than for men.

General conclusion

It may be concluded that job training is more likely to lead to top management posts (in the industries studied) than are academic qualifications. This further emphasises the desirability of job training for women.

Jobs during past ten years

All informants were asked how many employers they had worked for during the past ten years. Answers are as follows:

Number of employers during past ten years	*Formulators (all)**	*Implementers*		
		All	*Men*	*Women*
	%	%	%	%
One	55.9	53.7	54.9	38.1
Two	23.4	17.8	19.7	6.3
Three	7.6	13.0	11.5	27.0
Four	1.7	9.1	6.7	28.6
Five	3.1	3.1	3.5	–
Six or more	.4	.6	.6	–
Many, freelance	1.8	–	–	–
Not stated	6.1	2.7	3.1	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average number of jobs	1.60	1.89	1.82	2.46

*The 3 women formulators have had an average of 1.37 jobs.

The earlier Women's Employment Survey found that working women had an average of 2.12 jobs during the past ten years. Another survey⁽¹⁾ found an average of 2.16 jobs for all working women and 2.30 jobs for all working men. Men formulators' and implementers' averages are a little lower and women implementers' a little higher than those of working men and women as a whole.

Although the present findings indicate that women implementers are likely to change jobs a little more frequently than are men, the difference is not very great. No woman formulator or implementer has had as many as five jobs in the past ten years.

All three women formulators and 92.3% of women implementers expect to go on working until retirement.

---

(1) *Labour Mobility in Great Britain* by Amelia Harris (HMSO 1966)

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to their own wives' working

Married men informants were asked whether their wives are working, and, if so, what their attitudes are. Those whose wives are not working were asked what their attitudes would be if their wives were to work.

95.4% of men formulators and 83.6% of men implementers are married.

21.3% of married formulators' wives and 32.3% of married implementers' wives are working. These figures compare with 44.5% of all married women who were working at the time of the Women's Employment Survey. The earlier survey showed, however, that where the husband of a married woman was in a professional or managerial occupation she was less likely to work or intend to work than where her husband was in another class of occupation.

The overall attitudes to wives' working at present on the possibility of wives' working in the future are as follows:

	Formulators with:		*Implementers with:*	
(unweighted bases)	*Working wives* (48)	*Non-working wives* (150)	*Working wives* (57)	*Non-working wives* (130)
	%	%	%	%
Strongly approves, would strongly approve	41.8	13.4	41.9	15.8
Approves, would approve	41.8	19.9	37.2	25.6
No strong feelings	10.0	48.0	18.2	38.2
Disapproves, would disapprove	6.4	9.5	2.7	12.5
Strongly disapproves, would strongly disapprove	–	6.5	–	4.6
Not stated, can't say	–	2.7	–	3.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

These attitudes are much more favourable to working wives than are those which all married women interviewed in the earlier Women's Employment Survey ascribed to their husbands, which were as follows:

Husband's attitude (as described by wife)	*Married women* *Working*	 *Not working*
	%	%
Strongly approves/would strongly approve	9.4	3.1
Approves/would approve	39.0	17.0
Has no strong feelings	35.6	31.7
Disapproves/would disapprove	10.9	25.8
Strongly disapproves/would strongly disapprove	2.8	19.9
Can't say/don't know	2.3	2.5
Total	100.0	100.0

The differences between the findings of the earlier survey and the present one may represent a change in attitudes to working wives. On the other hand, in the earlier survey, wives may have interpreted their husbands' attitudes as being less favourable than they actually were.

What is evident from both surveys is that husbands whose wives are working are on average much more favourably disposed than are those whose wives are not working. It is of course impossible to say whether wives are likely to be influenced by their husbands' attitudes and not go to work or whether when a wife is working her husband finds there are advantages in her so doing and moderates his attitude. Another finding common to both surveys is that an appreciable proportion of husbands whose wives are not working have no strong feelings either way.

The socio-economic groups of the jobs done by working wives are as follows:

	Wives of:	
	Formulators	*Implementers*
(unweighted bases)	(48)	(57)
Socio-economic group	%	%
Managerial, professional	18.2	16.9
Intermediate non-manual	20.0	12.2
Junior non-manual	52.7	54.7
Personal service	2.7	10.8
Skilled manual	3.6	2.7
Semi-skilled manual	2.7	2.0
Own account workers	–	.7
Total	100.0	100.0

The level of jobs done by the wives of formulators and implementers are on a higher level than those done by working women as a whole (only about one working woman in twenty is in a managerial job). On the other hand the great majority of the jobs in the above table are at a lower level than those of the husbands. It seems that men in managerial positions are quite willing to accept that their wives should work at jobs of a much lower status than their own.

Tasks done around house by married men

One aspect of equality between the sexes is the sharing of domestic tasks. The extent to which married men formulators and implementers say they participate in these activities are as follows (percentages across).

	Proportion of task done by husband :					
	None	*One quarter*	*About one half*	*More than one half*	*All*	*Not stated*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Formulators						
Preparing, cooking meals	52.4	38.4	6.3	.2	–	2.7
Washing up	27.8	53.1	11.0	1.8	3.3	3.0
Washing up, ironing, mending	85.2	11.0	.4	.2	–	3.3
Other housework	57.7	32.1	6.7	.2	–	3.3
Care of children	52.8	35.0	8.7	.6	–	3.9
Shopping, errands	40.7	34.8	16.7	1.8	.2	5.8
Household decoration & repairs	24.0	13.0	11.8	16.3	31.3	3.6
Gardening	11.0	8.1	25.4	16.7	35.2	3.6
Other tasks	83.9	4.5	.4	–	4.1	7.1
Proportion of all tasks	1.4	73.8	17.1	–	–	7.7
Implementers						
Preparing, cooking meals	58.3	32.5	6.8	.2	.4	1.8
Washing up	25.2	46.3	17.6	2.6	6.8	1.5
Washing, ironing, mending	85.8	11.8	.6	.2	–	1.5
Other housework	56.0	28.9	13.2	.2	–	1.8
Care of children	67.4	26.3	4.4	.6	–	1.3
Shopping, errands	35.8	29.9	25.0	5.2	.2	3.9
Household decorations & repairs	22.2	10.3	16.2	11.4	37.4	2.5
Gardening	9.1	8.3	21.9	15.5	42.7	2.5
Other tasks	89.7	1.4	–	–	4.4	4.5
Proportion of all tasks	1.5	72.1	18.7	1.1	–	6.6

The figures for formulators and implementers are very similar. Taken overall, virtually none say they give no help at all, but nearly three-quarters do no more than one-quarter of the household tasks. Decorating and gardening are the only two tasks where appreciable percentages of husbands claim to do more than half. Time did not permit an investigation of the number of hours husbands have available to assist their wives in the house.

The number of married women implementers (10 unweighted) is too small for detailed analysis, but the *percentage who say their husbands do none of each task are as follows:*

Tasks	%
Preparing meals	69.0
Washing up	51.7
Washing, ironing, mending	89.7
Other housework	69.0
Care of children	100.0
Shopping, errands	86.2
Household decorations, repairs	51.7
Gardening	44.8
Other tasks	89.7
No tasks done at all	41.4

These figures are mostly so much greater than the percentages of husbands who say they do none of a particular task or of all tasks that the overall picture differs significantly. Only a minority of the wives of men informants are working, so it might have been expected that the percentages of married men who admit to doing no household tasks would have been higher because many tasks would be done by wives without assistance while their husbands are at work. It seems more probable that husbands are exaggerating the extent to which they help, because a wife would be more likely to underestimate the proportion of a task done by her husband than to say he did not do it at all.

Married informants with non-working wives were asked whether their wives are likely to do paid work in the future and, if so, whether they expect to give more assistance with household tasks when their wives start work; 26.0% of these formulators and 21.1% of these implementers say their wives are likely to take up paid work. Only 13.2% of these formulators and 10.9% of these implementers expect to give more help.

Taking all the findings into account it seems legitimate to conclude that, among married men of the status of formulators and implementers at least, giving help with household tasks does not appear to be a necessary concomitant of a wife's going out to work. This conclusion receives some support from the finding of the earlier Women's Employment Survey that only 67.8% of working married housewives received help from their husbands.

Ideas for children's future

It has often been said that discrimination begins in the family during childhood and that parents frequently believe that further education is wasted on girls. In order to find out whether there is any factual basis for this statement, informants who had any children aged 11 and over still in full-time education were asked, in respect of each such child, whether they expect him or her to go on to further education and what kind of job they personally would like each child to do.

The following tables are based on all children aged 11 or more who are still in full-tim education (79.2% of formulators and 64.0% of implementers have no children in this group).

	Children of.					
	Formulators:			Implementers:		
	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls
(Unweighted bases)	(72)	(41)	(31)	(129)	(58)	(71)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parent's expectations						
Child at or expected to go to.						
University	49.4	62.8	38.4	38.3	52.4	30.6
College of education	9.0	1.0	15.6	16.5	23.0	12.9
Technical college	4.2	7.6	1.3	6.4	7.1	6.0
Secretarial college	2.8	–	5.1	10.6	–	16.4
Other further education	10.6	2.0	17.7	14.0	5.6	18.5
Can't say what kind	5.5	3.6	7.2	6.7	4.8	7.8
Not certain what child will do	13.4	20.4	7.6	1.4	.8	1.7
Child not expected to go on to further education	5.1	2.6	7.2	6.1	6.3	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

We have shown elsewhere that for 17.7% of formulators and 10.9% of implementers their full-time education finished at age 19 or later. It follows that many formulators and implementers expect a higher level of education for their children, both boys and girls, than that which they themselves have had.

The differences between the percentages of boys and of girls who are not expected to go on to any form of further education are not very great, but the percentages who are expected to go to university are much higher in the case of boys.

There are some differences between the expectations of formulators and implementers. Few of the former expect their sons to train as teachers or their daughters to train as secretaries, while these are comparatively popular forms of training for, respectively, the sons and daughters of implementers. It is noteworthy, however, that no sons of either are expected to take secretarial training.

	Children of:					
	Formulators:			Implementers:		
	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls
Job which parent would like child to do	%	%	%	%	%	%
Teaching	18.0	3.1	30.4	20.7	24.7	18.5
Medicine, dentistry	12.0	21.4	5.3	3.4	4.8	2.6
Nursing	4.4	–	8.1	13.7	–	21.1
Accountancy	1.2	2.0	.4	.8	.8	.9
Law	3.7	6.6	1.3	4.7	10.4	1.7
Professional engineer	5.1	11.2	–	1.4	4.0	–
Science	3.5	6.1	1.3	.8	–	1.3
Other professions	6.1	6.1	5.9	7.9	8.0	7.7
Banking 'business'	5.5	5.6	5.5	3.6	5.6	2.6
Clerical, secretarial	.9	–	1.7	10.1	–	15.5
Art, design	1.6	–	3.0	–	–	–
Other jobs requiring specific training	1.4	3.5	.4	1.1	3.2	–
Other jobs	10.1	7.6	12.2	17.7	23.5	14.6
'Up to him/her'	20.1	12.2	26.6	18.6	11.6	22.4
Don't know	11.0	15.6	7.2	3.6	5.2	2.8
(Some parents name more than one job)						

It is interesting that among both formulators and implementers more than half would like their children (both boys and girls) to enter one of the professions. Comparatively few mention commercial or industrial jobs. It is noteworthy, however, that the great majority of the professions suggested for girls consists of teaching and nursing. No formulators or implementers consider professional engineering a desirable job for girls and none consider secretarial or clerical work desirable for boys.

It is evident that any parental influence on the choice of a career for the daughters of formulators and implementers is unlikely to be in the direction of encouraging them to enter occupations which are masculine strongholds.

Chapter VIII

Joint formulators and implementers

Introduction

The organisational structure of the establishments covered by the survey varied considerably. This was only to be expected and it was therefore necessary to devise methods of sampling and questionnaires which would be effective under a variety of different circumstances. We were primarily concerned with functions within the establishment rather than with individuals.

Formulation and implementation of policy are basically different functions. Formulators and implementers were separately sampled and separate questionnaires were constructed for the individuals fulfilling each function, although some questions, mainly those dealing with attitudes and backgrounds, were common to both.

In the event, we found that at roughly half the establishments the functions of formulator and implementer were combined, while in the remainder they were separate. Where the functions were combined it was not possible because of the time element to ask the same individual the whole of both questionnaires so that some questions had to be omitted. Most of the attitude questions which were common to both were among those asked.

In reporting the findings in respect of formulators and implementers we have been concerned mainly with two things: to give an account of management practices and to show the attitudes and backgrounds of the people who fulfil each of the two functions. Where we have dealt with management practices the questions asked were usually different and the problem of duplication does not arise. In the case of attitudes and backgrounds, however, it has been necessary, in order to present a statistically complete picture of the people who fulfil each function, to include the joint formulator-implementer group in the tables both to formulators and to implementers. It is therefore desirable to examine some of the characteristics of this joint group, which might be expected to be particularly influential in their organisations. It is also necessary to assess the effect on the findings of treating this group as part of both.

None of the joint group are women, which is further confirmation of the fact that women are scarcely represented at all in the counsels of higher management.

Nature of establishment

We first compare the nature of the establishments in which the joint formulator-implementers are found. In the following table we show the percentages of all formulators and of all implementers who combine the two functions. (Theoretically the two sets of figures should be identical, but because it was not always possible to interview both formulator and implementer at an establishment there are slight differences.)

		Joint formulator-implementers as % of: All formulators	Joint formulator-implementers as % of: All implementers
		%	%
All establishments		49.8	49.3
Total number of employees	249 or less	51.0	51.4
	250-499	48.5	46.3
	500 or more	47.9	46.5
Number of women	99 or less	59.3	59.3
	100-249	34.8	34.2
	250 or more	47.5	45.2
Percentage of women	9% or less	54.0	55.4
	10-24%	54.3	52.0
	25-40%	66.3	65.7
	50% & over.	37.2	37.0
E.P. introduced	Yes	43.4	44.3
	No	53.7	53.7
	None doing same work	52.0	58.0
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	47.5	45.9
	Engineering etc.	54.2	56.4
	Textiles, clothing etc.	59.4	58.3
	Transport & communication	(42.0)	(38.7)
	Commerce etc.	(39.1)	(39.1)
	Distribution	(35.2)	(35.2)
Broad region	Central	54.9	56.5
	Northern	40.8	39.7
	Southern	66.4	65.2

This kind of comparison shows the types of establishments in which joint formulator implementers are more likely to be found. There appears to be no consistent pattern and most individual differences are not significant. That between establishments with 50% or more of women employees and those with less than 50% is, however, significant. Presumably in establishments with a high percentage of women many managements find there is a need for a separate individual to implement policy towards women.

Posts held: to whom responsible

The following comparisons show that the joint formulator-implementer group more closely resemble formulators than implementers in terms of the posts they hold and the level of management to whom they are responsible.

	All Formulators	*Formulators only*	*Joint*	*Implementers only*	*All implementers*
(unweighted basis)	(212)	(101)	(111)	(111)	(222)
	%	%	%	%	%
Post held					
Chairman, managing director	15.9	16.2	15.5	–	7.6
Personnel director	5.2	7.7	2.6	–	1.3
Other director	21.6	16.9	26.3	6.4	16.1
General manager	17.5	19.9	15.2	3.9	9.4
Personnel manager, officer	17.2	21.3	13.0	39.0	26.3
Manager of department	16.1	13.2	18.9	20.9	19.9
Other posts	6.6	4.8	8.5	29.8	19.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
To whom responsible					
Chairman, vice chairman	12.2	12.5	11.8	.4	6.1
Managing director	27.9	20.2	35.6	13.8	24.5
Board of directors	35.2	41.9	28.5	27.7	28.1
	75.3	74.6	75.9	41.9	58.7
General manager	4.1	4.4	3.7	13.8	8.9
Head of department	7.9	9.6	6.3	19.8	13.2
Other person or body	12.7	11.4	14.1	24.5	19.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In the joint group, the formulator function predominates and the effect of including them as part of the implementer group is to raise the status of the latter. Where the implementation of personnel policy is carried out by a separate individual he or she is frequently of comparatively junior status.

The individuals themselves

Differences in the characteristics of individuals are best seen by comparing the percentages of each of the groups which have each characteristic.

		All formulators	*Formulators only*	*Joint*	*Implementers only*	*All implementers*
		%	%	%	%	%
Age	39 and under	23.4	26.5	20.4	23.8	22.1
	40-54	61.3	60.7	61.9	46.5	54.0
	55 & over	14.1	11.0	17.4	29.4	23.5
	Not stated	1.1	1.8	.3	.3	.4
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Terminal education age	15 & under	26.4	12.1	40.7	43.9	42.3
	16-18	51.3	59.6	43.0	44.6	43.8
	19 & over	21.4	26.8	15.9	10.4	13.1
	Not stated	.9	1.5	.4	1.0	.7
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attitude to E.P.	For	74.7	62.9	86.7	76.6	81.5
	Others	25.3	37.1	13.3	23.4	18.5
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attitude to women in senior positions	For	42.6	43.8	41.5	50.0	45.8
	Others	57.4	56.2	58.5	50.0	54.2
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attitude to training for women	For	65.3	61.8	68.9	61.7	65.2
	Others	34.7	38.2	31.1	38.3	34.8
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Discrimination index	For all three	26.2	23.5	28.9	35.2	32.1
	For any two	38.9	36.4	41.5	32.7	37.0
	For any one	26.4	26.5	26.3	23.4	24.8
	For none	8.5	13.6	3.3	8.6	6.2
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The attitudes of the joint group to the three aspects of equality for women are not entirely consistent, but taken overall are closer to those of implementers than of formulators. The percentage of them in favour of equal pay is significantly higher than the percentage of the formulators-only group. A corollary of this is that the attitude of formulators as a whole towards equal pay appears more favourable by virtue of the inclusion of the joint group.

Chapter IX Management attitudes to equality at work

Introduction

We have said that we have based our discrimination index on the attitudes of formulators and implementers to three important aspects of equality at work: equal pay; more women in senior positions; more training for women. In this section we examine in some detail the attitudes of formulators and implementers to each of these and show how the discrimination index is derived. To help in assessing some of the findings we give below the percentages of all formulators and all implementers who come into each discrimination category (full details appear later in the section).

In favour of:	*All formulators* %	*All implementers* %
All three	26.2	32.1
Any two	38.9	37.1
Any one	26.4	24.8
None	8.5	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0

Equal pay

Equal pay for equal work or 'the rate for the job' has been at the head of the list of demands made by women workers for many years in their attempts to achieve equality with men. Since the passage of the Equal Pay Act 1970 it has become a burning issue in many industries. Because of this it has been widely discussed at all levels and no investigation into differences in employment practices would be complete without obtaining some information about existing ideas on the subject.

Equal pay was therefore the first of the major equality issues to be put to informants.

We commenced our approach to attitudes to equal pay by means of an open question:

> 'How do you yourself feel about equal pay?'

This was followed by a direct question about overall attitudes.

This form of approach was adopted because it seemed likely that few people would declare outright opposition to equal pay (this proved in fact to be the case) and, once having committed themselves, would be unlikely to mention any reservations they might have.

The answers to the open question are as follows:

Feelings about equal pay	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %
In favour (no qualifications)	46.7	61.3
In favour (with some reservations)	8.7	10.2
Against	1.7	4.6
For in some ways, against in others	33.2	19.0
Other overall attitudes	4.8	2.6
No strong feelings either way	3.9	1.3
Don't know, not answered	1.0	1.0

Reasons for being against equal pay*	Formulators %	Implemente %
If women are paid more it will be harder for them to get jobs	12.7	4.2
Women cannot or will not work same hours	5.7	4.6
Lack of continuity or stability in women's employment	5.9	2.7
It would be against the traditional concept of male and female roles, would affect family life	5.2	1.8
Women cannot do same work as men	3.0	4.0
Man should earn more because of his responsibilities as breadwinner	3.7	1.6
Cost to employers	3.0	1.9
Women not able to work nights	1.1	.4
Other reasons	13.9	11.1

*these are the reasons given by those 'against' and those 'against in some ways'.

Those with policy-making responsibility are less likely than those who carry out policy to be unreservedly in favour of equal pay.

The difference between the percentages of formulators and implementers who are unreservedly in favour of equal pay is statistically significant. It is accounted for by the higher percentage of formulators who are in favour of equal pay in some ways but against in others, and not by greater outright opposition. In fact the percentage of implementers who spontaneously express outright opposition is slightly higher than that of formulators (although the difference is not significant).

The main difference in the reasons given for opposition to equal pay is the higher percentage of formulators who say that higher pay would make it harder for women to get jobs, although the percentages giving reasons other than this are almost all higher in the case of formulators. Many of the popularly quoted reasons for opposition to equal pay receive comparatively few mentions. Particularly striking are the low percentages who mention nightshift restrictions or the cost to employers. The explanation of the difference in attitudes between formulators and implementers is evidently not due to the greater preoccupation of formulators with the financial aspects. It seems more likely that they give greater weight to each of the other arguments which are advanced.

The numbers do not justify very detailed tables, but there are three comparisons which are worthwhile.

The first is between those who subsequently declare themselves as in favour of equal pay and those who do not (i.e. those who are neutral and those against – there are very few of the latter). Those in favour account for 75.8% formulators and 81.9% of implementers.

	Formulators:		Implementers:	
Feelings about equal pay	In favour of E.P. %	NOT in favour %	In favour of E.P. %	NOT in favour %
In favour (no qualifications)	57.9	11.9	70.4	20.2
In favour (with reservations)	10.0	4.6	10.2	10.1
Against	–	5.3	–	22.2
For in some ways, against in others	26.9	55.0	15.1	36.4
No strong feelings	.2	15.3	.9	3.0
Other overall attitudes	4.0	7.6	1.3	8.1
Don't know, not answered	1.0	.7	2.1	–

	Formulators:		Implementers:	
	In favour of E.P.	NOT in favour	In favour of E.P.	NOT in favour
	%	%	%	%
Reasons for being against equal pay				
Will be harder for women to get jobs	7.1	30.5	3.8	6.1
Women do not work same hours	5.1	7.6	3.8	8.1
Lack of continuity in women's employment	5.1	8.4	2.0	6.1
Against tradition, would affect family life	3.2	11.3	1.5	3.0
Women cannot do same work as men	2.7	3.8	2.9	9.1
Man is breadwinner	1.0	12.2	.7	6.1
Cost to employers	2.7	6.9	1.6	4.0
Women not able to work nights	1.5	–	–	2.0
Other reasons	9.6	27.0	9.1	18.5

One would obviously expect those who are on the whole in favour of equal pay to have fewer reservations than those who are neutral or opposed. There are, however, a number of important conclusions to be drawn. The percentages of formulators unreservedly in favour of equal pay in each group are lower than the corresponding percentages of implementers, but the percentage of implementers not in favour who say spontaneously they are opposed to equal pay is much higher than among the corresponding group of formulators, while the percentages who are both for and against show the reverse pattern.

Among both groups of formulators the percentages giving each reason for opposition are in most cases higher than the corresponding percentages of implementers. This may well be an indication that those formulators who oppose equal pay feel very strongly on the matter.

The second comparison is between those of different discrimination indexes.

	Formulators in favour of:				Implementers in favour of:			
	All three	Any two	Any one	None	All three	Any two	Any one	None
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Feelings about equal pay								
In favour (without qualifications)	62.0	44.6	49.7	(–)	76.1	64.5	52.2	(–)
In favour (some reservations)	7.0	8.5	9.1	(13.0)	7.4	9.4	12.5	(21.2)
Against	–	2.4	1.4	(4.3)	–	2.0	3.7	(42.4)
For in some ways, against in others	27.5	34.1	25.9	(69.6)	14.2	21.7	19.9	(24.2)
No strong feelings either way	–	9.5	–	(2.2)	–	.5	3.7	(3.0)
Other overall attitudes	2.8	–	12.6	(8.7)	2.3	1.5	5.1	(–)
Don't know, not answered	.7	.9	1.3	(2.2)	–	.5	2.9	(9.1)
Reasons for being against equal pay								
Will be harder for women to get jobs	12.0	5.2	15.4	(41.3)	3.4	4.4	4.4	(6.1)
Women do not work same hours	5.6	2.4	11.2	(4.3)	4.0	1.0	12.5	(–)
Lack of continuity in women's employment	2.8	10.4	2.8	(4.3)	–	5.4	2.9	(–)
Against tradition, would affect family life	2.8	4.3	11.2	(–)	.6	1.0	5.1	(–)
Women cannot do same work as men	.7	4.7	2.8	(2.2)	2.8	2.0	4.4	(21.2)
Man is breadwinner	.7	.9	10.5	(4.3)	–	1.0	2.9	(9.1)
Cost to employers	1.4	3.3	2.8	(6.5)	1.1	3.0	1.5	(3.0)
Women not able to work nights	–	1.4	2.1	(–)	–	–	1.5	(–)
Other reasons	6.3	15.2	11.9	(32.6)	7.4	11.8	8.1	(39.4)

The pattern is as might be expected as far as the discrimination groups are concerned. It is interesting, however, that there are marked differences between formulators and implementers whose discrimination index is the same.

A general conclusion which can be drawn from the two preceding tables is that, while few formulators or implementers express outright opposition to equal pay, there are many who have serious reservations about it, the one most often mentioned being that women will find it harder to get jobs if equal pay is introduced. It is worth mentioning that the people who give this answer come almost entirely from three industrial groups, namely food manufacturing; engineering; textiles etc. These are all industries where equal pay does not generally apply at the present time (1973). This answer is also more likely to be given by those whose education finished at 15 or under than by those whose education finished at 19 or over.

The third comparison is between informants from establishments where (in 1973) equal pay has been introduced, from establishments where it has not and from those where no men and women are doing the same work(1).

	Formulators			*Implementers*		
	Establishments where :			*Establishments where:*		
	E.P. exists	*E.P. does not exist*	*None same*	*E.P. exists*	*E.P. does not exist*	*None same*
Feelings about equal pay	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
In favour (without qualifications)	50.8	44.7	43.9	78.4	53.2	50.0
In favour (with reservations)	12.7	6.7	6.1	8.1	9.4	12.5
Against	.5	2.7	1.0	–	6.7	9.1
For in some ways, against in others	19.6	39.6	42.9	11.4	24.4	22.7
No strong feelings either way	9.0	.4	3.1	.5	.8	3.4
Other overall attitudes	6.3	5.5	–	1.1	4.3	–
Don't know, not answered	1.1	.4	3.1	.5	1.2	2.3
Reasons for being against equal pay						
Will be harder for women to get jobs	9.0	14.1	16.3	1.6	7.1	2.3
Women do not work same hours	1.6	7.5	7.2	1.6	4.3	6.8
Lack of continuity in women's employment	3.7	7.1	7.1	2.2	4.3	–
Against tradition, would affect family life	6.3	4.3	5.1	–	2.4	3.4
Women cannot do same work as men	4.8	.4	6.1	3.8	2.0	11.4
Man is breadwinner	6.9	1.6	3.1	1.1	.4	6.8
Cost to employers	–	5.1	3.1	–	3.9	–
Women do not work nights	–	–	6.1	–	.8	–
Other reasons	3.2	19.2	20.4	4.9	14.6	17.0

It is interesting that, in establishments where equal pay has been introduced, implementers are notably more enthusiastic than formulators. Perhaps surprisingly this is not accounted for by greater concern about cost; no formulators or implementers in equal pay establishments mention the cost.

It seems therefore, that among management at least, the arguments to be countered by those who are opposed to discrimination on grounds of sex are not mainly those which are concerned with the alleged lesser ability of women. The argument that women will find it harder to get jobs is not borne out by experience in fields where equal pay has been in force for some years (for example, national and local government, teaching). It may represent a subconscious desire to justify opposition to equal pay, which some informants may feel is an unpopular opinion to put forward, particularly when talking to a woman interviewer.

The social arguments are deep rooted and longstanding (John Stuart Mill quoted them over a century ago).

(1) These are based on formulators' statements. Elsewhere we shall show that in some establishments there is disagreement between the individuals interviewed. According to formulators equal pay had been introduced in roughly one-third of establishments.

Overall attitude to equal pay

After they had spoken in general terms about their attitudes to equal pay, informants were asked a "forced choice" question:

"On the whole, would you say you are in favour, have no strong feelings either way or are against equal pay?"

In view of the importance of this question, answers are given in full in the tables which follow. Here we summarise the attitudes of formulators and implementers.

	Formulators %	*Implementers* %
Attitude to equal pay		
In favour	75.8	81.9
Neutral	22.0	11.7
Against	1.8	4.7
No opinion, not stated	.4	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0

(Differences between formulators and implementers are not statistically significant)

Few formulators or implementers are prepared to declare themselves against equal pay, but sizeable minorities are neutral.

Most of the differences revealed in the tables are not statistically significant whether between formulators in different groups or between formulators and implementers in the same groups.

We have said earlier that few formulators or implementers mention the cost to employers as a reason for being dubious about equal pay. It is noteworthy, however, that the percentages of formulators and implementers who are in favour of equal pay decrease with increasing size of establishment and with increasing numbers of women employed. The trend is broken in the case of percentages of women by the low percentage in favour among formulators in establishments where less than 10% of employees are women, possibly because many formulators in these establishments have little experience of women's work and cannot envisage women doing the same work as the men in their establishments.

Overall attitudes of formulators and implementers to equal pay by age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay and discrimination index)

	Total[1]	*Age*			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*		*Discrimination index : In favour of :*			
		39 & under	*40 – 54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16 – 18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*NOT for*	*Three aspects*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131	142	211	143	46
Unweighted figures	212	50	120	40	40	114	55	157	55	60	83	50	19
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	75.8	71.0	76.9	79.3	84.6	68.7	81.9	100.0	–	100.0	79.1	71.3	(–)
Neutral	22.0	24.2	22.5	17.1	14.7	30.2	12.1	–	90.8	–	19.0	25.2	(93.5
Against	1.8	4.8	.6	2.4	.7	1.1	5.2	–	7.6	–	1.4	3.5	(4.3
Not stated	.4	–	–	1.2	–	–	.9	–	1.5	–	.5	–	(2.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	120	294	131	232	240	72	449	99	176	203	136	33
Unweighted figures	222	59	113	48	69	108	42	171	51	64	89	57	12
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	81.9	69.2	89.1	78.6	82.3	83.3	79.2	100.0	–	100.0	89.6	66.9	(–)
Neutral	11.7	25.0	7.5	9.2	8.6	14.6	12.5	–	64.6	–	8.4	25.0	(39.4)
Against	4,7	3.3	2.4	11.4	8.6	1.3	2.8	–	26.3	–	1.5	3.7	(54.5)
Not stated	1.6	2.5	1.0	.8	.4	.8	5.5	–	9.1	–	.5	4.4	(6.1)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] The total includes those whose age or terminal education age was not given.

Overall attitudes of formulators and implementers to equal pay (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	75.8	78.5	73.8	69.8	83.8	65.2	67.8	71.8	87.9	75.5	71.6	81.0	74.5	69.4
Neutral	22.0	21.2	23.1	22.9	15.9	32.6	20.3	27.4	12.1	18.4	26.0	18.5	22.7	26.5
Against	1.8	.3	3.1	5.2	.3	2.2	8.5	.9	–	4.1	2.3	–	2.4	4.1
Not stated	.4	–	–	2.1	–	–	3.4	–	–	2.0	–	.5	.4	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548(1)	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	99	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222(1)	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	81.9	87.2	81.6	65.7	87.7	77.2	67.7	81.8	84.6	81.8	80.6	90.8	75.2	81.8
Neutral	11.7	8.6	11.8	21.2	11.3	10.9	16.1	17.3	8.9	12.1	10.2	8.1	15.3	9.1
Against	4.7	3.8	4.4	8.1	.7	9.8	9.7	.9	3.3	5.1	7.4	.5	8.3	4.5
Not stated	1.6	.3	2.2	5.0	.3	2.2	6.5	–	3.3	1.0	1.8	.5	1.2	4.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(1) Totals include establishments where no formulator was interviewed hence no information was obtained about the introduction of equal pay.

Overall attitudes of formulators and implementers to equal pay (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc.*	*Trans. & commun.*	*Commerce etc.*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Souther*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	75.8	(61.0)	74.0	77.6	(52.2)	(96.9)	(85.2)	73.9	73.2	79.6
Neutral	22.0	(37.3)	19.1	21.2	(46.4)	(1.6)	(14.8)	22.5	25.4	15.9
Against	1.8	(1.7)	6.1	.6	(–)	(–)	(–)	2.1	1.0	3.5
Not stated	.4	–	.8	.6	(1.4)	(1.6)	(–)	1.5	.4	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
Attitudes of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of equal pay	51.9	78.7	76.0	85.4	(88.0)	(78.1)	(81.5)	72.8	83.3	87.8
Neutral	11.7	14.8	14.6	12.0	(9.3)	(1.6)	(18.5)	21.7	8.4	9.6
Against	4.7	1.6	8.7	1.2	(–)	(18.8)	(–)	4.3	6.0	1.7
Not stated	1.7	4.8	.7	1.2	(2.7)	(1.5)	(–)	1.2	2.3	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Formulators' impressions of attitudes to equal pay of men and women colleagues and of people who work for him

Formulators were asked:

'How do your (men colleagues) (women colleagues) (people who work for you) feel about equal pay? On the whole, would you say they are in favour, have no strong feelings either way, or are against?'

The answers to the questions are as follows:

	All formulators	*Formulators' attitude **	
		In favour	*Neutral*
Alleged attitude of men colleagues	*%*	*%*	*%*
In favour of equal pay	34.1	43.1	5.9
Neutral	41.3	32.8	72.3
Against	12.0	9.7	15.1
Don't know what their attitude is	11.6	13.9	5.0
No men colleagues	.9	.5	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alleged attitude of women colleagues			
In favour of equal pay	53.7	58.9	36.1
Neutral	11.1	7.1	23.5
Against	.7	–	1.7
Don't know what their attitude is	20.5	21.4	18.5
No women colleagues	14.0	12.4	20.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Alleged attitude of people who work for him			
In favour of equal pay	43.4	53.5	10.9
Neutral	27.9	20.0	53.8
Against	9.6	7.5	15.1
Don't know what their attitude is	16.9	16.1	20.1
No people working for him	2.2	2.9	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Formulators who are against equal pay are omitted from the breakdown (they are included in the total) because their unweighted number (8) is too small to justify analysis. In this context it is desirable to show separately those formulators who are neutral.

No attempt was made to define the three groups of people and the interpretation is therefore that of the informants themselves. It is reasonable to assume that "colleagues" are people of roughly the same level, while "people who work for him" are those directly responsible to him.

The answers are not to be taken as providing factual evidence about the climate of opinion within establishments. They are evidence only of what formulators think are other people's opinions and the questions are, in part at least, what are known as "projective".

The technique of asking a "projective" question is frequently used in cases where an informant may be reluctant to express his own views in answer to a direct question but will ascribe those views to people similar to himself if asked a question about such people. In the present case, where virtually all formulators are men, the question about men colleagues' views on equal pay is a projective question. It is noteworthy that the views ascribed to men colleagues are a good deal less favourable to equal pay than those of formulators themselves. The conclusion must be either that formulators as a body are more favourably disposed towards equal pay than are other members of senior management, or that some of them are reluctant to express an unfashionable opinion, particularly when questioned by a woman interviewer herself in receipt of equal pay. (It will be remembered that 75.8% of formulators declare themselves in favour and only 1.8% say they are opposed).

Support for the latter view is given by the finding that in all three cases (men and women colleagues, people working for them) their views are said to be less favourable to equal pay than those of the formulators. For example, among formulators who have said that they themselves are in favour of equal pay only 43.1% say that their male colleagues, 58.9% say that their female colleagues and 53.5% say that the people who work for them are in favour. The pattern is less marked in the case of women colleagues, possibly because formulators are less likely to ascribe their own views to women. It may partly arise because a comparatively high proportion say they have no women colleagues (which may be another indication of the scarcity of women in senio jobs).

If we compare the alleged views of women colleagues of formulators with the alleged views of men colleagues, we obtain the following:

	*Alleged attitude of men colleagues **			
	For equal pay	*Neutral*	*Against*	*Not known*
(unweighted bases)	(84)	(77)	(21)	(26)
	%	%	%	%
Alleged attitude of women colleagues				
For equal pay	76.2	48.9	44.6	15.4
Neutral	1.6	19.3	21.5	–
Against	–	.4	3.1	1.5
Not known	9.2	20.6	10.8	61.5
No women colleagues	13.0	10.8	20.0	21.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Percentaging in the opposite direction gives:

	*Alleged attitude of women colleagues**			
	For equal pay	*Neutral*	*Not known*	*No colleagues*
(unweighted bases)	(107)	(23)	(41)	(37)
	%	%	%	%
Alleged attitude of men colleagues				
For equal pay	48.6	5.0	15.2	31.6
Neutral	37.6	71.7	41.1	31.6
Against	10.0	23.3	6.2	17.1
Not known	3.4	–	35.7	18.4
No men colleagues	.3	–	1.8	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*"No men colleagues" and "women against E.P." are omitted from the breakdowns because of the small numbers.

There is a marked association between the alleged views of men colleagues and those of women colleagues. That is to say, where men colleagues are said to be in favour of equal pay, women colleagues are also more likely to be said to be so, and vice versa.

In 26.0% of establishments both men and women colleagues are said to be in favour of equal pay, in 7.9% both are said to hold neutral views, while in only .4% are both said to be against it.

The conclusion to be drawn from the answers to this set of questions is that the attitude of management as a whole is likely to be less favourable than appears from the stated attitudes of formulators in answer to the direct question. Either the views of other members of management, as described by formulators, are less favourable than formulators' own views, or formulators have been reluctant to admit openly to unfavourable opinions, or both.

Reasons for existing differences between the sexes in positions and training

We have said that equal pay has been a demand of working women for many years. So, too, have equality of opportunities for promotion and equal training facilities. Since the passing of the Equal Pay Act these other demands have been put forward with renewed force, because it has become obvious that equal pay on the conditions laid down in the Act will not benefit women who have not been trained to do the same work as men. Nor will it benefit women who are not considered eligible for promotion to better paid posts. A series of questions relating to these topics was therefore included in the survey.

"A great deal has been said recently about the small numbers of women who rise to senior positions or do skilled work. What, in your opinion are the reasons for the state of affairs?"

Formulators and implementers answered as follows:—

	Formulators %	*Implementers* %
Reasons relating to women themselves		
Women are not career-conscious	39.3	36.5
Break in working life retards progress	25.5	23.3
Marriage, bringing up family, makes them less able to accept responsibility etc.	14.9	16.4
Women are unwilling to train	8.1	7.1
Women are temperamentally unfitted for senior positions	6.5	6.6
Cannot rely on their length of service	6.1	9.1
Women are unreliable	3.5	3.6
Women change jobs too often	3.3	7.6
Other reasons critical of women themselves	5.5	7.7
Reasons not relating to women themselves		
Society's attitude, tradition	21.2	14.8
Women are not given a chance to train	15.9	14.6
Men in managerial positions discriminate against women	10.0	9.2
Male prejudice	8.3	11.9
Difficulties with trade unions	2.0	.9
Other employees dislike working for women	1.7	4.8
Vague, irrelevant answers, don't know	3.3	4.7

The answers given by formulators and by implementers follow the same pattern. Comparatively few of the reasons relating to women themselves imply lack of ability, although lack of career-consciousness and unwillingness to train may imply a lack of the qualities necessary to get to the top. The percentages who say that employers are unwilling to train women exceed the percentages who say women are unwilling to train. This is the case in all the sub-groups of both samples, but it is interesting to note that those groups who include a higher than average percentage who mention unwillingness of employers to train usually also include a higher than average percentage who mention unwillingness of women to be trained. These include informants from larger establishments, from establishments with 250 or more women employees, from the engineering industry and the distributive trade, from establishments where equal pay has not been introduced, and those whose full-time education finished at age 19 or later.

The high percentages of mentions of the break in women's working lives and of the effects of marriage imply that there is still a widespread acceptance of the idea that the pattern of men's working lives should be regarded as the norm.

Attitudes to women in senior positions

The open question was followed by a specific one:

"Do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing if more women occupied senior positions?"

Answers are given in detail in the following tables. The attitudes of formulators and implementers are summarised here.

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
Attitude		
Good thing	41.5	46.3
Bad thing	11.1	10.8
Good in some ways, bad in others	10.0	13.7
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	38.4	29.2
Total	100.0	100.0

This is evidently a much severer test of fundamental attitudes to equality than is the similar question about equal pay. Whereas roughly three-quarters of formulators and four-fifths of implementers declared themselves in favour of equal pay, less than half of either are whole-heartedly in favour of more women in senior positions.

It will be remembered that the overwhelming majorities of formulators and implementers are men, so that there may well be an element of self-protection subconsciously present in these answers. Since they are men in senior positions themselves, possibly aspiring to further promotions, they may see themselves threatened with additional competition if more women had the chance to rise.

The attitudes of formulators and implementers taken as a whole are almost identical, which was not the case with equal pay.

Both formulators and implementers in establishments employing 250 or more women are more likely to be favourably disposed than are those employing less than 250.

Among formulators, those in establishments with 10-24% of women are more favourably disposed than those in establishments with higher or lower percentages.

It is perhaps disquieting to note that among both formulators and implementers, those from establishments where equal pay has *not* been introduced are more favourably disposed towards women in senior positions than are those in establishments where equal pay is the rule. Perhaps there are elements of self-protection here.

We have remarked on the fact that the percentage of formulators in the transport and communications industrial group who are in favour of equal pay is significantly lower than the percentage in the commerce group. So far as women in senior positions are concerned, the reverse is the case.

Regional differences among formulators are more marked than in the case with attitudes to equal pay, those in the south being most favourably disposed to women in senior positions. The same is true of implementers, but to a much less marked extent.

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to more women occupying senior positions (by age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay and discrimination index)

		Age			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*		*Discrimination index: In favour of:*			
	Total[1]	*39 & under*	*40–54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16–18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*NOT for*	*Three aspects*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131	142	211	143	46
Unweighted figures	212	50	120	40	40	114	55	157	55	60	83	50	19
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	41.5	37.9	41.0	50.0	44.7	39.2	42.2	42.6	38.2	100.0	36.5	4.2	(–)
Would be a bad thing	11.1	16.1	8.1	15.9	15.4	13.3	.9	14.4	.8	–	19.9	12.6	(–)
Good in some ways, bad in others	10.0	5.6	12.9	4.9	6.3	14.0	5.2	11.9	3.8	–	16.1	10.5	(10.9)
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	37.4	40.4	38.0	29.2	33.6	33.5	51.6	31.1	57.2	–	27.5	72.7	(89.1)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (bases for percentages)	548	120	294	131	232	240	72	449	99	176	203	136	33
Unweighted figures	222	59	113	48	69	108	42	171	51	64	89	57	12
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	46.3	50.0	42.2	53.4	49.1	50.0	27.8	50.6	27.3	100.0	35.5	4.4	(–)
Would be a bad thing	10.8	11.7	7.8	16.8	14.2	9.6	2.8	11.4	8.1	–	20.2	10.3	(12.1)
Good in some ways, bad in others	13.7	5.8	13.6	21.4	12.1	17.5	6.9	12.9	17.2	–	20.2	15.4	(39.4)
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	29.2	32.5	36.4	8.4	24.6	22.9	62.5	25.1	47.4	–	24.1	69.9	(48.5)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] The total includes those whose age or terminal education age was not given.

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to more women occupying senior positio (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whethe equal pay introduced)

	Total	*Total number of employees*			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50%& over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	41.5	35.1	51.5	49.0	43.0	37.6	45.8	38.9	55.2	45.9	33.5	32.8	49.4	37.8
Would be a bad thing	11.1	13.6	11.5	2.1	11.6	13.3	1.7	7.1	11.2	16.3	10.7	7.9	14.5	8.2
Good in some ways, bad in others	10.0	11.1	8.5	8.3	10.3	7.7	15.2	2.7	6.0	18.4	12.1	12.7	9.4	6.1
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	37.4	40.2	28.5	40.6	35.1	41.4	37.3	51.3	27.6	19.4	43.7	46.6	25.7	47.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	99	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	46.3	44.4	47.8	50.5	43.4	48.9	53.2	37.3	50.4	41.4	50.9	39.5	51.6	44.3
Would be a bad thing	10.8	10.2	15.4	6.1	13.2	8.2	6.5	11.8	11.4	17.2	6.9	9.7	10.6	13.6
Good in some ways, bad in others	13.7	17.9	8.8	7.1	12.5	17.9	6.5	4.5	17.9	16.2	14.8	17.3	13.4	10.2
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	29.2	27.5	28.0	36.3	30.8	25.0	33.8	46.4	20.3	25.2	27.4	33.5	24.4	31.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Attitudes of formulators and implementers towards more women occupying senior positions (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing			*Trans. & Commun.*	*Commerce etc.*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
		Food etc.	*Engineering*	*Textiles, etc.*						
ll formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
ttitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	41.5	(32.2)	54.3	41.8	(62.3)	(18.8)	(33.3)	46.5	34.1	59.3
Would be a bad thing	11.1	(18.6)	6.1	11.5	(–)	(18.8)	(5.6)	14.1	6.6	12.4
Good in some ways, bad in others	10.0	(10.2)	9.2	7.3	(1.4)	(21.9)	(16.7)	13.4	9.1	8.0
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	37.4	(39.0)	31.3	39.4	(36.3)	(40.5)	(44.4)	26.0	50.2	20.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ll implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	46.3	49.1	54.0	46.5	(64.0)	(32.8)	(35.2)	46.0	45.1	49.6
Would be a bad thing	10.8	21.3	13.5	14.3	(2.7)	(–)	(5.6)	22.5	4.0	13.9
Good in some ways, bad in others	13.7	6.6	16.3	12.5	(–)	(37.5)	(24.1)	4.0	21.0	6.1
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	29.2	23.0	22.2	32.7	(33.3)	(29.7)	(35.1)	27.5	29.8	30.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Reasons for attitudes towards women in senior positions

In the following summary of reasons for thinking it is a good thing or a bad thing for more women to occupy senior positions, the percentages are based on all informants. This has been done to enable an estimate to be made of the comparative importance of each reason among formulators and implementers as a whole.

Reasons – good thing	*Formulators* %	*Implementer* %
There should be equality of opportunity, women are as good as men	19.0	16.4
Balance of men's and women's influence desirable	10.5	16.8
Would improve quality, wider choice of candidates	7.9	8.2
Women should be given the chance to show what they can do	8.3	5.8
Specific characteristics valuable in management	6.1	7.2
Better understanding of people, more sympathetic	3.1	5.4
Women handle women better	1.7	4.3
Would be an incentive to other women	2.2	1.1
Other reasons	5.6	4.7
Vague answers	6.5	3.8
Don't know, not stated	5.2	5.1
Reasons – bad thing		
Women are unreliable because of family demands	5.9	4.3
Other employees would resent it	2.0	5.6
Women are temperamentally unsuited	3.7	2.7
Contrary to society we live in	1.5	1.1
Women are too autocratic, bitchy	1.3	1.1
Women lack authority	–	1.3
Other reasons	3.2	6.2
Vague, irrelevant answers	3.9	3.6

It can be seen that favourable reasons considerably outweigh unfavourable. While for the most part the former refer to women's abilities, either in themselves or in relation to those of men, the unfavourable reasons include an appreciable proportion which relate to the reactions of other people or of society as a whole.

Attitudes towards training women for more highly skilled work

We have already said that a demand which is high on the list of those who want equality in employment for women is that training facilities should be made available for women. Informants' attitudes to this demand were tested by means of the question

> "Do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing if more women were trained for some sort of highly skilled work?"

Taken as a whole, the attitudes of formulators and implementers are very similar, as shown by the following summary (Full details are given in the tables which follow).

Attitude	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %
Good thing	65.5	67.0
Bad thing	10.3	8.4
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.3	8.4
Not sure, no opinion	15.9	16.2
Total	100.0	100.0

This is not so severe a test of attitudes towards equality as the question on attitudes to women in senior positions, but it is more severe than the question on attitudes to equal pay. Among both formulators and implementers who declare themselves in favour of equal pay only about two-thirds are in favour of training women for more highly skilled work. Taken in conjunction with the finding that downright opposition to training is significantly higher among formulators and implementers in establishments where equal pay has been introduced than among those in establishments where it has not, one is led to the conclusion that some managements do not mind introducing equal pay so long as there are comparatively few women who qualify for it under the terms of the Equal Pay Act.

A majority in all groups except the following think training more women would be a good thing: formulators and implementers whose education finished at age 19 or later; implementers who are in favour of less than two "discrimination factors". The comparatively low percentages of the more highly educated who are in favour of training are mainly accounted for by higher percentages who are undecided. This is also the case with their attitudes to women in senior positions and may be due to a subconscious desire for self protection.

The similarity of attitudes among formulators and implementers taken as a whole masks the finding that the pattern of attitudes is not entirely the same. For example, in spite of the small numbers involved the percentage of implementers in the distribution industry who are in favour is just significantly higher than the percentage of formulators, while the reverse is the case in the textiles and clothing industry.

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to training women for skilled work (by age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay and discrimination index)

		Age			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*		*Discrimination index: In favour of:*			
	Total(1)	*39 & under*	*40–54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16–18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*NOT For*	*Three aspects*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131	142	211	143	46
Unweighted figures	212	50	120	40	40	114	55	157	55	60	83	50	19
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	65.5	51.6	73.3	56.1	64.3	74.1	49.1	67.2	60.3	100.0	84.4	24.5	(–)
Would be a bad thing	10.3	16.9	7.2	13.4	15.4	10.1	5.2	10.2	10.7	–	5.7	21.0	(30.4)
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.3	7.3	5.1	23.2	9.1	7.2	10.3	7.8	9.9	–	7.1	16.1	(15.2)
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	15.9	24.2	14.4	7.3	11.2	8.6	35.3	14.8	19.1	–	2.8	38.5	(54.3)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	120	294	131	232	240	72	449	99	176	203	136	33
Unweighted figures	222	59	113	48	69	108	42	171	51	64	89	57	12
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	67.0	73.3	65.6	64.9	64.7	77.9	38.9	68.3	60.6	100.0	74.4	29.4	(–)
Would be a bad thing	8.4	10.0	4.1	16.8	12.5	4.2	9.7	6.0	19.2	–	6.4	11.8	(51.5)
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.4	3.3	9.2	11.4	12.5	2.9	13.9	9.6	3.0	–	11.8	14.7	(6.1)
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	16.2	13.3	21.1	6.9	10.3	15.0	37.5	16.0	17.2	–	7.4	44.1	(42.4)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(1)The total includes those whose age or terminal education age was not given.

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to training women for skilled work (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	65.5	65.5	68.5	61.5	67.9	64.6	55.9	51.3	69.0	87.7	60.9	78.3	61.2	52.0
Would be a bad thing	10.3	13.6	6.2	5.2	11.2	10.5	5.1	15.9	6.9	4.1	12.1	1.6	19.6	3.1
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.3	4.4	13.8	13.5	6.3	7.2	22.0	6.2	12.9	4.1	8.8	2.6	9.4	16.3
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	15.9	16.5	11.5	19.8	14.6	17.7	16.9	26.5	11.2	4.1	18.1	17.5	9.8	28.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	99	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	67.0	66.1	72.8	61.6	66.6	67.9	66.1	53.6	57.7	82.8	71.7	74.1	65.0	60.2
Would be a bad thing	8.4	7.7	10.3	8.1	6.6	11.4	8.1	6.4	8.9	8.1	9.3	.5	13.0	9.1
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.4	8.3	9.6	7.1	10.6	6.0	4.8	6.4	13.0	4.0	8.8	7.6	6.7	13.6
Not sure, no opinion, not answered	16.2	17.9	7.3	23.2	16.2	14.7	21.0	33.6	20.3	5.1	10.2	17.8	15.3	17.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Attitudes of formulators and implementers to training women for skilled work (by industry group and broad region)

		Industry group						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
	Total	*Food, etc.*	*Engineering, etc.*	*Textiles etc.*	*Transport & Commun*	*Commerce etc.*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
Attitude of formulators	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	65.5	(62.7)	68.7	73.9	(55.1)	(56.3)	(57.4)	73.2	58.2	73.5
Would be a bad thing	10.3	(5.1)	3.1	4.8	(8.7)	(21.9)	(13.0)	10.6	6.3	8.0
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.3	(8.5)	13.0	9.7	(1.4)	(1.4)	(9.3)	9.9	6.3	10.4
Not sure, no opinion	15.9	(23.7)	15.2	11.6	(34.8)	(20.4)	(20.3)	6.3	29.2	8.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	552	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
Attitude of implementers	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Would be a good thing	67.0	83.6	68.3	61.9	(61.3)	(53.1)	(85.2)	68.8	63.0	74.8
Would be a bad thing	8.4	4.9	9.5	5.4	(8.0)	(25.0)	(–)	5.8	7.8	13.0
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.4	8.2	10.3	6.4	(4.0)	(18.8)	(3.7)	11.6	6.1	10.4
Not sure, no opinion	16.2	3.3	11.9	26.3	(26.7)	(3.1)	(11.1)	13.8	23.1	1.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Reasons for attitudes towards training of women

The following summary of the reasons for thinking it a good thing or a bad thing to train women for more highly skilled work is based on all informants so as to provide an easy comparison of the relative importance of each.

	Formulators %	*Implementers* %
Reasons – good thing		
There should be equal opportunity, women are capable of it	23.4	26.2
There is a shortage of skilled labour	25.8	23.6
To provide better, more interesting, job opportunities for women	6.5	12.5
Women are patient, conscientious, dextrous etc.	5.4	3.8
Women's point of view valuable	4.1	3.6
To show what they can do	3.3	.4
Would promote co-operation between sexes	1.1	1.5
Women would get higher pay	.9	1.4
Other specific reasons	2.2	2.9
Vague, irrelevant answers	14.2	9.4
No reason given, don't know	1.3	1.1
Reasons – bad thing		
Training would be wasted because of lack of continuity	5.7	9.0
Would lead to unemployment among men	7.0	4.9
Women lack strength	1.7	1.6
Would lead to neglect of family	.6	.5
Other specific reasons	2.0	1.1
Vague, irrelevant answers	.9	.4

A majority of the reasons given for favouring greater training opportunities for women are concerned with the rights and abilities of the women themselves. An appreciable number, however, emphasise industry's need for skilled workers. This contrasts with the small percentages who think men would be put out of work.

Another test of attitudes of formulators

One way of testing attitudes is to present informants with a set of statements on controversial matters and ask them whether they disagree with each. Such a question was included for formulators. Unfortunately, owing to the length of interview this question had to be omitted in some cases (in all cases where the same person was both formulator and implementer). The following percentages are based on roughly half the formulators and should therefore be treated with caution.

The percentage shown is that of those asked who gave an answer favourable to equality. In some cases this means that they agree with the statement, in others that they disagree.

Statements	*Formulators* %
I would prefer to have only men working here (disagree)	98.1
Industry could not carry on without women workers (agree)	87.1
I would not like a male secretary (disagree)	25.9
Women are more conscientious workers than men (agree)	20.5
Women are less likely than men to take industrial action (agree)	65.0
Women's place is in the home (disagree)	58.6
Married women with children are less reliable workers (disagree)	40.7
Older married women are more stable employees than men (agree)	28.5
It is not worth training young women for more skilled work because they leave after a few years to have families (disagree)	50.2
Part-time workers are a nuisance (disagree)	78.7

Perhaps the most useful conclusion to be drawn from these figures is that there is still a great deal of latent opposition to complete equality.

For example, the low percentage who disagree with the statement "I would not like a male secretary" implies that a majority regard women as more suitable for the role of ministrant. (There may, of course, be sexual undertones here of a different character from those under investigation).

It is also disquieting to note that less than three-fifths of formulators disagreed with the statement that woman's place is in the home, and only half disagree with the statement that it is not worth training young women.

The percentage who agree that older married women are more stable employees than men is low. Evidence from other sources(1) indicates that women as a whole are not less stable employees than men and that older women are much more stable than younger women. It appears that many employers as yet do not appreciate the likelihood that older women will remain in one job for a long period.

The numbers are too small to compare the attitudes of different groups of formulators. It can tentatively be said that there is little consistency to be found in individual groups except that those whose education finished at age 19 or later appear more likely to give answers favourable to equality.

Attitudes of women implementers to aspects of equality

There are only three women formulators, so that any information derived from their answers would be valueless. There are only 18 (unweighted figures) women implementers, so that detailed separate analysis would not enable many definitive conclusions to be drawn. In the context of attitudes to the three important aspects of inequality, however, it is desirable to establish whether opposition to greater equality for women is solely a masculine prerogative. To facilitate comparisons we bring together in the following table the attitudes of men and women implementers.

(1) *A Survey of Women's Employment* by Audrey Hunt (HMSO 1968) Vol. I p. 83, Vol. II Tables D12a & D19a.

	All implementers	*Men*	*Women*
(Unweighted bases)	(222) %	(204) %	(18) %
Attitude to equal pay			
In favour	81.9	80.4	90.5
No strong feelings either way	11.7	12.6	4.8
Against	4.7	4.7	4.8*
Not answered	1.8	2.0	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attitude to more women in senior positions			
Good thing	46.3	40.8	88.9
Bad thing	10.8	11.5	4.8*
Good in some ways, bad in others	13.7	15.3	1.6
Not sure, no opinion	29.2	32.4	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attitude to training more women for skilled work			
Good thing	67.0	66.8	68.3
Bad thing	8.4	8.9	4.8*
Good in some ways, bad in others	8.4	6.8	20.6
Not sure, no opinion	16.2	17.5	6.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Discrimination index			
In favour of: all three	32.1	28.9	57.1
any two	37.1	36.9	38.1
any one	24.8	28.0	–
none	6.0	6.2	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

*These are all accounted for by views of one woman (this is an effect of the "weighting" used to restore correct proportions).

The percentages of women implementers who say they are in favour of each aspect and of all three are higher than the percentages of men, but some of the differences are smaller than perhaps might have been expected.

The differences between the percentages of men and women implementers who are in favour of more women in senior positions is statistically significant. This is interesting because it might be anticipated that women who are themselves in senior positions might be afraid of increased competition. Evidently the great majority of women implementers are loyal to their own sex in this respect. The percentage of men unable or unwilling to advance an opinion on this aspect of equality is significantly higher than the percentage of women, possibly from a reluctance to express an opinion which they believe to be unpopular at the present time.

It can be concluded that, although opposition to discrimination is much stronger among women implementers than men, there are still some women who are prepared to accept the present situation.

Discrimination index

As an overall estimate of the strength of feeling of senior management towards equality of treatment for women, we have calculated a discrimination index based on these three fundamental questions: equal pay; more women in senior positions; more training for women.

Details of the percentages of formulators and implementers in different groups who are in favour of none, one, two or all of these are given in the tables which follow the text and we comment on these later. The following compares the attitudes of all formulator and implementers.

	Formulators	*Implementers*		
	Total	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*
	%	%	%	%
In favour of:				
All three	26.2	32.1	28.9	(57.1)
Any two	38.9	37.1	36.9	(38.1)
Any one	26.4	24.8	28.0	(–)
None	8.5	6.0	6.2	(4.8)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

As we shall show later, the overall similarity between attitudes of all formulators and implementers is made up of a number of differing views which tend to cancel each other out.

The more favourable attitudes of women implementers is not unexpected although egalitarians may be disappointed that an appreciable proportion of their sex are not wholly committed to all these aspects of equality.

It is noteworthy that in respect of the discrimination index, the attitudes of formulators who combine this function with that of implementer are more favourable in their attitudes than those who are formulators only.

	Formulators only	*Joint*	*Implementers only*
	%		%
In favour of:			
All three	23.5	28.9	35.3
Any two	36.4	41.5	32.7
Any one	26.5	26.3	23.4
None	13.6	3.3	8.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Earlier tables have shown the percentages who are in favour of each individual aspect. The following shows which aspects are most likely to be favoured in combination.

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
In favour of :		
All three	26.2	32.1
Senior positions and training	8.1	3.7
Senior positions and equal pay	6.1	9.5
Training and equal pay	24.7	23.9
Senior positions only	1.1	1.1
Training only	6.5	7.3
Equal pay only	18.8	16.4
None of these	8:5	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0

The much higher proportion who favour combinations which include equal pay are probably a consequence of the much longer period during which the campaign for equal pay has been in progress. The other aspects have attracted attention for a comparatively short time.

To complete this summary, we show the percentages who are in favour of each individual aspect among the groups in favour of two only and one only.

	Formulators in favour of:		*Implementers in favour of:*	
	Two	One	Two	One
	%	%	%	%
In favour of:				
Equal pay	79.1	71.3	90.1	66.2
Senior positions	36.5	4.2	35.5	4.4
Training	84.4	24.5	74.4	29.4

These figures emphasise the predominance of equal pay as the most favoured aspect of equality.

When considering the detailed tables which follow it should be remembered that, in comparisons between formulators and implementers based on characteristics of the establishments, we are comparing people from the same, or virtually the same, establishments. In comparisons based on characteristics of the individuals we are not necessarily comparing people from the same establishments. The first set of comparisons gives some indication of the effects of the work environment and the second set of the effects of personal background on the attitudes of management.

A striking feature of the tables is the difference between the attitudes of formulators and implementers in the same industry. The numbers are small in most instances, but it is reasonable to conclude that there is by no means complete unanimity between formulators and implementers. The same is true of formulators and implementers in establishments with different percentages of women workers and of those in establishments where no women are doing the same work as men.

A comparison between formulators and implementers in all manufacturing and all non-manufacturing industries reveals that the difference between formulators and implementers is more marked in the case of non-manufacturing than of manufacturing industries.

	Manufacturing		*Non-manufacturing*	
	Formulators	*Implementers*	*Formulators*	*Implementers*
(unweighted bases)	(164)	(172)	(48)	(50)
In favour of:	%	%	%	%
All three	31.0	31.0	17.1	34.2
Any two	36.1	36.9	44.4	37.3
Any one	24.8	29.0	29.4	17.1
None	8.2	3.1	9.1	11.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Formulators and implementers in the South are consistently more favourably disposed to equality than their counterparts in the Central and Northern regions.

Formulators, and, to a less extent, implementers aged 39 and under appear to be less favourably disposed to equality than those aged 40-54. This may appear to be a surprising finding, so we examined separately those aged under 30. Although the numbers are very small it is worth showing the result.

	Formulators			*Implementers*		
	29 and under	*30–39*	*40 and over*	*29 and under*	*30–39*	*40 an over*
(unweighted bases)	(6)	(44)	(160)	(18)	(41)	(160
	%	%	%	%	%	%
In favour of:						
All three	(73.7)	13.3	27.4	(68.1)	16.4	31.1
Any two	(21.1)	26.7	43.0	(12.8)	38.4	39.5
Any one	–	48.6	21.9	(17.0)	31.5	24.7
None	(5.4)	11.4	7.7	(2.1)	13.7	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In spite of the small numbers the difference between the percentages in favour of all three among implementers under 30 and among those aged 30-39 is statistically significant (the same is probably true for formulators, but it would be unwise to draw firm conclusions because of the very small number aged under 30).

Two inferences seem justified. The first is that the youngest section of management is very much more favourably disposed to equality than the older section. Secondly, the 30-39 group is less favourably disposed than either younger or older groups, possibly because this group sees a greater threat to career prospects through intensified competition from women.

More highly educated formulators and implementers are slightly less favourable to equality than the other educational levels, the difference being more marked in the case of implementers. Possibly this is another group which fears more intensive competition.

Discrimination index
(by age, terminal education age and attitude to equal pay)

	Total(1)	*Age*			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*	
		39 & under	*40–54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16–18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*Not for*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131
Unweighted figures	212	50	120	40	40	114	55	157	55
In favour of:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	26.2	22.6	28.7	22.0	29.4	26.3	23.3	34.6	–
Any two	38.9	25.8	41.3	55.0	39.2	41.7	31.0	40.6	33.6
Any one	26.4	41.1	22.5	19.5	27.3	19.8	41.4	24.8	31.3
None	8.5	10.5	7.5	8.5	4.2	12.2	4.3	–	35.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	120	294	131	232	240	72	449	99
Unweighted figures	222	59	113	48	69	108	42	171	51
In favour of:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	32.1	36.7	32.0	29.0	30.6	39.2	15.3	39.3	–
Any two	37.1	28.3	34.7	50.4	42.7	35.0	26.4	40.6	20.2
Any one	24.8	25.8	31.6	9.2	18.5	24.2	47.2	20.1	46.5
None	6.0	9.2	1.7	11.4	8.2	1.7	11.1	–	33.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*i.e. equal pay; more women in senior positions; more training of women for skilled work.

(1) The total includes those whose age or terminal education age was not given.

Discrimination index
(by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whethe equal pay introduced)

	Total	*Total number of employees*			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced* (1)		
		Up to 249	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*1–9%*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	225	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
In favour of:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	26.2	24.1	26.2	33.3	30.8	18.2	27.1	19.5	42.2	30.6	19.1	19.6	33.7	19.4
Any two	38.9	38.6	47.7	28.1	38.1	43.1	30.5	33.6	36.2	52.0	37.2	55.0	29.0	33.7
Any one	26.4	29.7	20.0	24.0	26.1	26.5	27.1	36.3	12.9	13.3	34.4	23.3	25.9	33.7
None	8.5	7.6	6.1	14.6	5.0	12.2	15.3	10.6	8.6	4.1	9.3	2.1	11.4	13.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	99	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
In favour of:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	32.1	32.9	32.3	29.3	29.8	37.0	29.0	26.4	32.5	30.3	35.6	29.2	32.7	33.0
Any two	37.1	37.7	41.9	28.3	41.1	30.4	37.1	26.4	33.3	48.5	39.4	49.7	34.6	25.0
Any one	24.8	23.6	22.1	32.3	26.5	22.8	22.6	40.9	29.3	18.2	17.1	17.3	25.2	36.4
None	6.0	5.8	3.7	10.1	2.6	9.8	11.3	6.4	4.9	3.0	7.9	3.8	7.5	5.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

(1) Establishments where no formulator was interviewed are excluded.
*i.e. equal pay; more women in senior positions; more training of women for skilled work.

Discrimination index (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food etc.	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc.*	*Trans & commun*	*Commerce*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
ll formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
In favour of	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	26.2	(22.0)	30.5	34.5	(15.9)	(15.6)	(20.4)	20.4	25.1	36.3
Any two	38.9	(35.6)	43.5	30.3	(47.8)	(42.2)	(42.6)	55.6	29.3	42.5
Any one	26.4	(18.6)	20.6	30.3	(18.8)	(40.6)	(29.6)	19.0	32.4	20.3
None	8.5	(23.7)	5.3	4.8	(17.4)	(1.6)	(7.4)	4.9	13.2	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
In favour of:	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All three aspects of equality*	32.1	(37.7)	31.0	28.6	(56.0)	(10.9)	(31.5)	22.5	33.9	39.1
Any two	37.1	(36.1)	43.6	32.1	(12.0)	(60.9)	(44.4)	52.9	29.5	37.4
Any one	24.8	(26.2)	20.6	36.3	(22.7)	(9.4)	(18.5)	16.7	29.5	22.6
None	6.0	(–)	4.8	3.0	(9.3)	(18.8)	(5.6)	8.0	7.1	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*i.e. equal pay; more women in senior positions, more training of women for skilled work.

So far we have been looking at the extent to which discrimination and non-discrimination exist among different groups of formulators and implementers. It is also useful to compare the characteristics of formulators and implementers who exhibit varying degrees of discrimination. Some of the characteristics are, of course, those of the establishments and not of the individuals.

This comparison is made in the table on the following page.

Formulators differ from implementers in their personal characteristics, so it is not surprising that there are marked differences in the age and terminal education age composition of the discrimination groups. What is of interest is that the pattern is not entirely the same for both. Both include comparatively high percentages of those aged unde 30 in the most non-discriminatory group, but, whereas the percentage of formulators in this group aged 40-54 is higher than in other groups, the comparable percentage of implementers is relatively low. However, both formulators and implementers include comparatively lower percentages of the more highly educated in the most non-discriminatory group.

It is not easy to summarise the findings in respect of the characteristics of establishments, partly because of the a-typical figures shown in a number of instances by the groups in favour of none of the aspects of equality. These may well be chance sampling variations, but it should not be overlooked that there are still a few people in top management who are opposed to equal treatment for both sexes.

		Formulators in favour of:				*Implementers in favour of:*			
		All three	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*	*All three*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
(unweighted bases)		(60)	(83)	(50)	(19)	(64)	(89)	(57)	(12)
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Age	29 & under	9.9	1.9	–	(2.2)	18.2	3.0	5.9	(3.0)
	30–39	9.9	13.3	35.7	(26.1)	6.8	13.8	16.9	(30.3)
	40–54	67.6	65.4	52.5	(52.2)	53.4	50.2	68.4	(15.1)
	55 & over	12.6	19.4	11.1	(15.2)	21.6	32.5	8.8	(45.4)
	Not stated	–	–	.7	–	–	.5	–	(6.1)
Terminal education age	15 & under	29.6	26.5	27.3	(13.0)	40.3	48.8	31.6	(57.6)
	16–18	51.4	55.0	38.5	(73.9)	53.4	41.4	42.6	(12.1)
	19 & over	19.0	17.1	33.6	(10.9)	6.3	9.4	25.0	(24.2)
	Not stated	–	1.4	.7	(2.2)	–	.5	.7	(6.1)
Total number of employees	249 or less	53.5	57.8	65.7	(52.2)	58.5	58.1	54.4	(54.5)
	250–499	23.9	29.4	18.2	(17.4)	25.0	28.1	22.1	(15.2)
	500 & over	22.5	12.8	16.1	(30.4)	16.5	13.8	23.5	(30.3)
Total number of women	99 or less	65.5	54.5	55.2	(32.6)	51.1	61.1	58.8	(24.2)
	100–249	23.2	37.0	33.6	(47.8)	38.6	27.6	30.9	(54.5)
	250 & over	11.3	8.5	11.2	(19.6)	10.2	11.3	10.3	(21.2)
Percentage of women	9% or less	15.5	18.0	28.7	(26.1)	16.5	14.3	33.1	(21.2)
	10–24%	34.5	19.9	10.5	(21.7)	22.7	20.2	26.5	(18.2)
	25–49%	21.1	24.2	9.1	(8.7)	17.0	23.6	13.2	(9.1)
	50% & over	28.9	37.9	51.7	(43.5)	43.8	41.9	27.2	(51.5)
E.P. introduced	Yes	26.0	49.3	30.8	(8.7)	30.7	45.3	23.5	(21.2)
	No	60.6	35.1	46.2	(63.0)	47.1	43.4	47.1	(57.6)
	None doing same work	13.4	15.6	23.1	(28.3)	16.5	10.8	23.5	(15.1)
	Not stated	–	–	–	–	5.7	.5	5.9	(6.1)
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	9.2	10.0	7.7	(30.4)	13.1	10.8	11.8	(–)
	Engineering	28.2	27.0	18.9	(15.2)	22.1	27.1	19.1	(18.2)
	Textiles etc.	40.1	23.7	35.0	(17.4)	27.3	26.6	44.9	(15.1)
	Transp. etc.	7.7	15.6	9.1	(26.1)	23.9	4.4	12.5	(21.2)
	Commerce etc.	7.0	12.8	18.2	(2.2)	4.0	19.2	4.4	(36.4)
	Distribution	7.7	10.9	11.2	(8.7)	9.6	11.8	7.3	(9.1)
Broad region	Central	20.4	37.4	18.9	(15.2)	17.6	36.0	16.9	(33.3)
	Northern	50.7	39.8	65.0	(82.6)	56.8	42.8	64.0	(63.6)
	Southern	28.9	22.8	16.1	(2.2)	25.6	21.2	19.1	(3.0)

Relating the discrimination indexes of formulators and implementers is not entirely straightforward. In addition to establishments where the functions are combined, the sample includes establishments where only a formulator or only an implementer was interviewed. The following table, therefore, is based only on establishments where both formulators and implementers were interviewed and where one person does not combine the two functions. (Weighted base 255, unweighted 95).

		Implementer in favour of:			
	Total	*All three*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
	%	%	%	%	%
Formulator in favour of:					
All three	25.1	8.8	7.6	8.6	–
Any two	36.9	9.8	16.7	5.3	5.1
Any one	23.5	5.1	9.0	7.8	1.6
None	14.5	10.9	2.0	1.6	–
Total	100.0	34.7	35.3	23.3	6.7

In only one-third of establishments where formulator and implementer are different individuals do they exhibit the same degree of non-discrimination. Obviously when both are in favour of all three aspects their views must be identical, but where both are in favour of two or of one they may be in favour of different aspects. The numbers are too small for meaningful analysis in greater detail, but the other evidence suggests that they are more likely to think alike in being in favour of equal pay.

Chapter X Appointments and promotions

Introduction

The White Paper 'Equality for women' [1] states:

'Their (i.e. women's) treatment at work continues to be unequal and unjust.'

"Women are often treated as unequal because they are alleged to be inferior to men in certain respects, and the consequences of their unequal treatment are then seen as evidence of their inferiority......... And many who make the important decisions about the treatment of women do not discriminate against them because of conscious personal prejudice but because of prejudices of which they are unaware, or the prejudices (real or assumed) which they ascribe to others - management, employees, customers or colleagues."

In this section we examine the way in which these factors operate at two important points in a career, namely, when an appointment is being made and when a promotion is being considered.

Engagement of employees in different categories

The first point in an employee's career where sex may be taken into account is when he or she applies for a job. When formulators were interviewed they were asked a number of questions about the methods which are used in the sampled establishments in making appointments to managerial positions, which included appointments made from outside. It is not only at management level, however, that discrimination, either open or hidden, may exist. Implementers were therefore asked a number of questions about the engagement of employees in different categories.

First they were asked whether they were responsible for engaging employees in any category. This covered all instances where the decision rested with them, either jointly or individually, whether or not the preliminary procedures were carried out by other people.

95.2% of implementers are responsible for the engagement of at least some categories of employees. The percentage varies very little in the sample groups, never falling below 86.4% or exceeding 98.7%. It can therefore be said that the great majority of implementers of policy exert an influence on the kinds of people who are engaged.

Categories of employees engaged

Not all implementers are directly concerned with the engagement of all categories of employees. In the first place, not all establishments employ all categories. Secondly, some categories may be either too senior or too junior for the policy implementer to be involved. To some extent there may be a sex differentiation over and above the status differentiation. The establishment may not employ one sex or the other in a particular category, or the engagement of employees of different sexes may be the responsibility of different individuals. The following summary should therefore be taken as merely indicating to what extent implementers as a whole are involved in the engagement of employees at different levels.

---

[1] *Cmnd* 5724 September 1974 pp 2 and 4

(The summary is based on all implementers, to facilitate comparisons. Percentages read across.)

	Implementer engages:				
	Men only	*Women only*	*Both**	*Neither*	*None*
	%	%	%	%	%
Non-Manual					
Managers	20.3	.7	23.7	50.4	4.8 = 100%
Supervisors	10.5	.5	16.8	67.2	4.8
Engineers, scientists, technologists	4.9	1.8	15.0	73.4	4.8
Technicians	7.1	.7	19.0	68.3	4.8
Office staff	29.7	3.3	33.0	29.3	4.8
Sales staff	7.6	.2	9.6	77.7	4.8
Security staff	2.9	.5	4.0	87.7	4.8
Medical	2.0	.5	8.2	84.4	4.8
Other professional or technical	3.4	.2	6.7	84.8	4.8
Manual					
Supervisors, foremen	12.9	2.2	19.7	60.3	4.8
Sales	1.4	–	1.4	92.4	4.8
Catering, domestic	19.4	1.8	25.5	48.4	4.8
Skilled	12.3	2.9	21.4	58.6	4.8
Apprentices etc.	3.1	.7	17.6	73.7	4.8
Semi-skilled	17.4	1.4	23.0	53.3	4.8
Unskilled	12.0	.2	31.5	51.4	4.8
Transport	4.2	.4	7.6	83.0	4.8
Unspecified foremen	4.9	–	4.2	86.1	4.8

*Includes those who did not specify the sex.

Attributes considered important when engaging different categories of workers

Implementers responsible for engaging workers in each category were asked which attributes they considered to be important in engaging workers in this category. An attempt was made to obtain specific answers by use of a prompt list and probing, but even so some answers tended to be vague. The numbers involved for individual categories are small for the most part (as can be seen by reference to the unweighted base figures in the tables which follow), so that more detailed classification would have little meaning.

A word of explanation about some of the headings used should help to make interpretation of the tables more easy.

Educational level. If a specific educational level, such as ONC, a degree, professional qualifications, commercial qualifications, etc. are mentioned, they appear under the heading of "other specific attainments". Answers such as "good education", "must have good general education", appear under "general level".

An answer is shown as *"intelligence in general"* where no reference is made to educatio levels or test attainments.

The heading, *"must have no children"* is usually found where women are concerned (though it is sometimes apparently a requirement in the case of men). It usually implie the possibility of unreliability because of the demands of the family.

"Other domestic requirements" includes answers such as "needs a stable home background", "family commitments must enable him to work shifts".

The attributes considered important when engaging different categories of *non-manual* workers are as follows:

	Category						
	Managers	*Supervisors*	*Scientists etc.*	*Technicians*	*Office staff*	*Sales staff*	*Other prof. & tech.*
(unweighted bases)	*(106)* %	*(83)* %	*(65)* %	*(68)* %	*(140)* %	*(56)* %	*(54)* %
Attributes							
Previous experience	95.2	86.5	87.6	78.1	71.4	73.1	58.6
Training	51.3	50.6	73.4	54.5	31.3	30.1	35.1
Educational level:							
"O" levels	15.6	12.9	2.5	14.5	22.0	13.5	3.6
Other specific attainments	36.0	19.0	49.4	37.7	17.7	12.4	49.5
General level	33.5	38.4	43.2	42.4	37.1	37.3	18.0
Fit, strong, able-bodied	2.8	13.5	12.4	33.7	6.9	5.2	5.4
Good appearance	13.5	6.5	1.2	1.0	5.9	19.2	12.6
Other physical characteristics	14.1	16.8	14.9	16.8	9.9	12.4	8.1
Pleasant personality	50.1	35.8	25.7	21.9	29.4	38.3	26.1
Reliable, responsible	7.3	15.5	7.5	6.7	17.0	7.3	3.6
Other personality aspects	40.0	64.5	34.0	38.7	27.1	52.8	30.6
Test attainments	12.1	7.7	11.6	26.9	25.8	11.4	13.5
Intelligence in general	6.7	2.3	.4	.3	10.9	2.6	–
Emphasis on youth	2.4	6.1	3.3	5.7	2.2	9.3	1.8
Emphasis on maturity	6.9	.6	–	2.0	1.6	4.1	–
Specific ages stated	17.0	25.2	7.5	23.6	6.6	8.3	18.0
Other references to age	18.6	20.6	24.1	16.8	19.5	11.4	12.6
Must have no children	–	7.7	10.8	20.9	11.8	3.1	2.7
Other domestic requirements	40.2	32.3	19.5	11.1	27.2	19.7	18.9
Salary asked must be reasonable	35.4	31.0	37.8	36.0	30.2	23.8	13.5
Other attributes	8.7	1.3	–	1.3	3.0	3.1	2.7

The attributes considered important when engaging different categories of *manual* workers are as follows:

	Category						
	Foremen	*Catering etc.*	*Skilled**	*Apprentices etc.*	*Semi-skilled*	*Unskilled*	*Trans-port*
(unweighted bases)	*(81)*	*(85)*	*(96)*	*(64)*	*(99)*	*(98)*	*(29)*
	%	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
Attributes							
Previous experience	87.0	57.4	83.7	22.4	63.7	34.0	(52.2)
Training	56.1	19.7	57.9	11.0	25.5	7.0	(20.9)
Educational level:							
"O" levels	1.3	–	1.0	20.3	1.3	–	(1.5)
Other specific attainments	14.9	3.5	27.7	21.1	9.9	4.9	(17.9)
General level	21.8	8.9	28.7	34.6	13.6	11.8	(10.4)
Fit, strong, able-bodied	22.9	22.1	30.7	11.0	38.9	34.8	(46.3)
Good appearance	6.8	14.1	1.2	2.1	.6	7.5	(25.4)
Other physical characteristics	13.0	12.4	19.3	21.9	16.8	33.5	(13.4)
Pleasant personality	40.3	21.7	16.3	25.3	22.9	18.6	(16.4)
Reliable, responsible	13.5	15.9	7.9	18.6	5.2	11.2	(14.2)
Other personality aspects	45.2	13.5	25.5	23.6	21.0	19.5	(17.9)
Test attainments	10.4	2.3	25.7	25.3	16.8	4.6	(13.4)
Intelligence in general	–	1.2	4.7	4.6	5.8	3.1	(–)
Emphasis on youth	4.7	1.2	5.0	30.4	4.8	2.1	(1.5)
Emphasis on maturity	1.0	.8	2.0	–	.4	–	(.7)
Specific ages stated	21.3	15.1	19.3	8.4	16.8	17.4	(17.9)
Other references to age	16.1	4.3	17.1	11.8	13.4	9.5	(10.4)
Must have no children	7.8	12.4	6.4	–	7.3	14.5	(1.5)
Other domestic requirements	15.6	19.7	12.6	9.3	19.7	18.8	(26.1)
Wages asked must be reasonable	23.4	13.9	31.7	8.4	19.9	18.6	(19.4)
Other attributes	4.2	8.1	3.0	8.4	2.8	5.8	(26.9)

*Skilled i.e. either (a) a craftsman in an occupation to which the normal method of entry is by apprenticeship or equivalent training or (b) a worker in an occupation where skill is acquired by considerable experience or where a minimum of 6 months training is essential.

Semi-skilled i.e. in an occupation needing between 1 and 6 months experience and/or training before becoming reasonably proficient.

Unskilled i.e. in an occupation needing no instruction or where less than 1 month's training or instruction is required.

Implementers' ideas of attributes possessed by men and women

After they had described the attributes which they consider important when engaging staff in different categories, implementers were asked whether they think they are more likely to find these attributes in men or women applicants.

Obviously the precise nature of an attribute considered necessary will vary according to the category of the job. For example, the educational level considered necessary for a scientist will not be the same as that for an apprentice and the personality considered appropriate for a foreman supervising manual workers would be out of place in a catering worker.

However, an examination of the opinions of implementers as to whether each attribute is more likely to be possessed by men or by women when taken over the whole range of categories is useful because it gives an indication of the general attitudes which lie at the back of the minds of people who engage staff. In so doing it shows some of the hidden prejudices which may need to be overcome.

It has the additional advantage of enabling attributes to be examined in more detail than is always possible in the case of individual categories, where the number of mentions of a particular attribute may be small.

Percentages are to be read across in the following summary.

	More likely to be found in:					
	(unweighted bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*	
Attributes	%	%	%	%	%	
Previous experiences	(872)	52.6	15.0	31.1	1.3	= 100%
Training	(471)	59.6	11.8	27.5	1.1	
Educational level:						
"O" levels	(105)	38.7	18.8	37.1	3.4	
Other specific levels	(278)	59.0	9.0	25.0	7.0	
General level	(317)	61.0	9.7	28.6	.7	
Fit, strong, able-bodied	(209)	75.0	5.2	18.8	1.0	
Good appearance	(83)	33.0	21.5	32.7	12.8	
Other physical characteristics	(233)	57.2	9.7	31.8	1.3	
Pleasant personality	(316)	55.1	13.8	29.3	1.8	
Reliable, responsible	(126)	44.1	22.1	29.4	4.4	
Other personality aspects	(410)	55.8	13.0	30.8	.4	
Test attainments	(179)	52.2	15.3	28.3	4.2	
Intelligence in general	(38)	47.3	19.8	32.0	.9	
Emphasis on youth	(76)	52.7	10.9	34.0	2.4	
Emphasis on maturity*	(21)	34.9	9.6	53.0	2.5	
Specific ages stated	(191)	58.9	16.8	23.6	.7	
Must have no children	(53)	43.0	31.7	19.5	5.8	
Other domestic requirements*	(304)	47.0	16.7	35.4	.9	
Wages or salary must be reasonable	(351)	55.4	9.6	33.7	1.3	
Other attributes	(68)	54.0	9.4	24.3	12.3	

*Percentages in this line should be treated with caution as the unweighted base is small.

The first and most striking - almost shattering - finding of these figures is that for every single attribute the percentage of implementers who think it is more likely to be found in men greatly exceeds the percentage who think it is more likely to be found in women. Except in the case of maturity it also exceeds the percentage who think the attribute is equally likely to be found in either sex.

This is probably the most forceful example of inbuilt prejudice that the survey reveals. Some of the attributes can be countered by facts: for example, the percentage of girls who obtain "O" level passes is slightly higher than that of boys and the average intelligences of men and women as measured by I.Q. tests are not very different. "Good appearance" must be a subjective assessment as must "pleasant personality", but commonsense would indicate that there are at least as many women of good appearance and pleasant personalities as there are men. The higher percentages who expect men to excel in the personality characteristics required for most jobs indicate that the criteria applied are masculine criteria which men are more likely to satisfy.

The lesson to be learned here is that a majority of the people who are responsible for the engagement of employees start off with the belief that a woman is likely to be inferior to a man as an employee. This means that a woman applicant has a harder task to convince the prospective employer that she is the most suitable candidate for the post. In view of the importance ascribed to "previous experience" it appears that all the makings of a vicious circle exist here: women have little chance of getting experience and so are less likely to obtain higher posts which require additional experience.

In many instances the number of mentions of an individual attribute in connection with a particular category are too few for reliable conclusions to be drawn. We have therefore extracted for each category the attributes which receive an adequate number of mentions.

Percentages are to be read across in all these tables.

	More likely to be found in:					
	(unweighted) bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Managers						
Previous experience	(98)	67.1	.4	32.1	.4	= 100%
Training	(56)	66.1	.8	33.1	–	
Education (specific aspects)	(49)	78.7	.8	20.5	–	
General education	(43)	77.1	–	22.9	–	
Physical characteristics	(43)	62.7	–	37.3	–	
Personality characteristics	(105)	64.7	.8	32.8	1.7	
Domestic requirements	(41)	62.3	1.0	36.7	–	
Salary required reasonable	(44)	66.3	–	32.6	1.1	
Non-manual supervisors						
Previous experience	(83)	59.0	9.7	30.6	.7	
Training	(73)	72.6	2.5	23.6	1.3	
Education (all, incl. general)	(55)	58.3	2.8	38.9	–	
Personality characteristics	(89)	49.7	11.2	38.5	.6	

The anticipation of masculine superiority is a little less marked in the case of the lower-level job, but even here the percentage of implementers who think men are more likely to possess the desired attribute never falls below 49.7%.

	More likely to be found in:					
	(Unweighted bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Engineers, scientists, technologists						
Previous experience	(57)	84.4	.9	14.7	–	= 100%
Training	(42)	85.9	–	14.1	–	
Specific educational attainments	(43)	79.0	1.6	19.4	–	
Personality characteristics	(43)	84.0	–	16.0	–	
Technicians						
Previous experience	(54)	83.6	1.7	13.8	.9	
Training	(36)	82.7	–	16.0	1.3	
Specific educational attainments	(47)	67.5	3.9	28.6	–	
Personality characteristics	(42)	77.8	–	21.2	1.0	
Office staff						
Previous experience	(108)	11.5	38.5	48.8	1.2	
Training	(49)	8.8	53.5	32.5	5.2	
Specific educational attainments	(55)	.7	32.6	41.7	25.0	
General education level	(53)	22.2	34.8	42.2	.8	
Personality characteristics	(100)	13.5	43.4	37.8	4.3	
Test attainments	(38)	12.8	39.4	34.0	13.8	
Salary required reasonable	(44)	17.3)	35.5	45.5	1.7	
Sales staff						
Previous experience	(43)	44.0	14.2	41.8	–	
Personality characteristics	(54)	53.7	14.7	31.6	–	

Among non-manual occupations only in the case of office staff do appreciable percentages of implementers expect women to excel in respect of the important characteristics. Even here, however, the percentage who believe the sexes to be equal as often as not exceeds the percentage who believe women to excel. It should also be remembered that typists and shorthand-typists are included in this category and that this is a predominantly feminine skill.

An examination of the figures for characteristics named by appreciable numbers in connection with manual occupations leads to similar conclusions.

	Most likely to be found in:					
	(Unweighted bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Foremen (manual)						
Previous experience	(69)	69.6	2.4	26.9	1.1	= 100%
Training	(42)	52.8	2.8	42.6	1.8	
Physical characteristics	(34)	63.4	3.7	31.7	1.2	
Personality characteristics	(71)	64.7	2.6	30.0	2.7	
Age requirements	(36)	72.3	6.0	16.9	4.8	

The picture is much the same as in the case of non-manual supervisors, except that the percentages who expect women to be better are lower in the case of manual foremen. It is perhaps unexpected to find that the percentages of implementers who think men are more likely to have had training is considerably lower in the case of manual foremen. The difference, which is only barely significant, may mean no more than that comparatively few of either sex have actually received training for management in the field of manual occupations.

	Most likely to be found in:				
	(Unweighted bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*
	%	%	%	%	%
Catering, domestic (manual)					
Previous experience	(50)	2.0	62.0	36.0	–
Physical characteristics	(48)	21.6	47.2	31.2	–
Personality characteristics	(46)	11.4	47.0	41.7	–

In this case the balance comes down on the side of women.

	Most likely to be found in :					
	(Unweighted bases)	*Men*	*Women*	*Both equally*	*Don't know*	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Skilled						
Previous experience	(87)	87.3	–	12.7	–	= 100%
Training	(55)	88.9	–	11.1	–	
Education (specific & general)	(51)	95.7	2.6	1.7	–	
Physical characteristics	(51)	93.3	–	5.8	.9	
Personality characteristics	(43)	94.0	3.0	3.0	–	
Age requirements	(41)	86.2	3.4	10.3	–	
Apprentices etc.						
Education (specific & general)	(58)	77.8	–	22.2	–	
Personality characteristics	(42)	88.8	–	11.2	–	
Semi-skilled manual						
Previous experience	(70)	48.5	8.8	40.0	2.7	
Physical characteristics	(58)	60.0	4.6	33.1	2.3	
Personality characteristics	(45)	50.4	13.3	33.6	2.7	
Age requirements	(41)	65.9	9.8	20.7	3.6	
Unskilled manual						
Physical characteristics	(71)	62.8	7.7	21.9	7.6	
Personality characteristics	(51)	61.3	2.5	35.3	.9	

It is difficult to find any real justification for implementers' attitudes in the case of apprentices. Nearly half the mentions of educational requirements are of general educational level and at the age of 16 or thereabouts there is much evidence that educational achievements do not differ greatly. Personality characteristics of teenagers may be different but not to the extent indicated by the figures in the table. In view of the demands made by many organisations for the admission of girls to apprenticeships, this evidence of anti-feminine feeling on the part of those responsible for engaging apprentices must give rise to disquiet.

A general conclusion which can be drawn is that for all categories except office staff and catering workers, most implementers expect men applicants to be superior in respect of almost all the characteristics which are considered important for that job.

It would be unreasonable to expect an employer to give preference to an applicant whom he considered to be inferior on good grounds. These findings indicate that many of the views held by those engaging staff have little or no basis in fact.

Sex preferred for different categories of workers

In order to investigate the extent to which the views expressed about the attributes possessed by men and women were rationalisations of latent prejudice, implementers were asked:

"If a man and a woman with *identical attributes* applied for a job in this category which would you take on?"

Their answers are as follows (percentages read across)

	Sex preferred						
	(Unweighted bases)	*Man*	*Woman*	*Either*	*Depends*	*Don't know*	
		%	%	%	%	%	
Non-manual							
Managers	(106)	68.7	1.2	21.2	4.0	4.9	= 100%
Supervisors	(83)	42.6	9.0	26.5	19.4	2.5	
Engineers, scientists	(65)	80.1	3.3	16.6	–	–	
Technicians	(68)	60.3	4.7	30.3	.7	4.0	
Office staff	(140)	15.9	30.4	40.5	5.8	7.4	
Sales staff	(56)	45.6	15.5	22.3	7.3	9.3	
Other non-manual	(91)	35.3	31.2	20.0	2.4	11.1	
Manual							
Supervisors, foremen	(81)	55.3	3.1	30.6	5.2	5.8	
Catering, domestic	(85)	11.2	55.7	28.8	2.3	2.0	
Skilled	(96)	70.5	3.0	23.8	2.2	.5	
Apprentices etc.	(64)	63.3	1.7	30.8	1.7	2.5	
Semi-skilled	(99)	47.5	14.7	28.7	6.0	3.1	
Unskilled	(98)	59.0	11.6	15.1	8.5	5.8	
Transport*	(29)	71.6	3.0	23.9	1.5	–	
Other manual*	(24)	53.1	20.4	16.3	2.0	8.2	

*Percentages in these lines should be treated with caution.

The only category in which a majority of implementers would give preference to a woman is that of catering and domestic workers. The percentage who would give preference to a woman for office work is higher than would give preference to a man, but a majority of this group either have no preference or are not prepared to make a decision.

A particularly interesting finding is the very high percentage who would give preference to a man in the case of engineers and scientists. Much has been said and written in recent years, by both Government and non-Government bodies, about the need for more scientists and technologists and there is also evidence that there has been a turning away from scientific subjects on the part of the boys in sixth forms at schools. This has been accompanied by a demand for the encouragement and assistance of girls to take up scientific or technological careers. Girls will not be inclined to do so if they feel that prospective employers would almost certainly give preference to men, even if qualifications were equal.

Reasons for preferring to take on a man or a woman

The final question in this series to implementers was:

"For what reasons would you be more likely to take on a man/woman?"

It is worthwhile considering the reasons given for all categories, as these show attitudes as a whole.

(Unweighted base) (all categories for which men are preferred)	*Implementers who are more likely to engage men* *(601)* %
Reasons for preferring a man	
Physical reasons	32.8
Get longer service from a man	12.3
Hours unsuitable, overtime, weekends	10.5
Dirty job, physical conditions bad	8.5
Women cannot control men	7.9
Women would hear bad language	6.2
Employees would rather work for a man	5.3
Women are less adaptable	2.3
Dangerous job	2.1
Unions would object	1.2
Women not allowed to work nightshift	.7
"Always been a man's job"	32.3
Other reasons	4.9
Vague, no reason given	3.1

The twin bogeys of union objections and restrictions on night work receive few mentions.

Some of the answers given can be considered reasonable, although if a woman applied for a particular job she would presumably be aware of such things as the physical requirements or the dirtiness of the job and the kind of hours she would require to work. There can be few women nowadays, even teenagers at good schools, who are unaware of the existence of four-letter words.

(Unweighted base) (all categories for which women are preferred)	*Implementers who are more likely to engage women* *(179)* %
Reasons	
Women more suitable (no details given)	50.9
Not a career job, men more ambitious	7.9
All other employees are women	7.7
Men would not want part-time work	7.0
"Always been a woman's job"	21.9
Other reasons	4.8
No reason given	7.0

The reasons given for preferring women are all negative or vague. There can be no escaping the fact that women are more likely to be preferred for their imagined limitations than for any merits they may possess.

It is evident that among those responsible for engaging employees there are strongly held opinions that women are second best employees. Not all their arguments are based on fact or reason, but they will need to be overcome if discrimination is to be ended.

Because of the small numbers involved there is little to be gained from detailed figures for individual categories. Some differences in the reasons given for preferring men are worth comment, but even in the two categories where the percentage preferring to engage a woman exceeds those who prefer to engage a man, (office and catering) there are no mentions of any positive qualities possessed by women.

The main differences between the reasons given for preferring men for different categories are as follows.

Physical reasons are given less often in the case of non-manual than of manual occupations, although even in the case of managers 16.5% of those who prefer to engage a man do so on physical grounds. For scientists and technologists the corresponding figure is 20.8% and for technicians 27.0%.

Longer service is more important in the case of non-manual occupations. 17.6% of those preferring men give this reason in the case of managers, 22.7% in the case of non-manual supervisors and 39.7% in the case of office staff. It is worth comment, however, that the corresponding figure for craft apprentices is 25.3%.

Women's supposed inability to supervise men is as might be expected mentioned only in the case of occupations which involve a measure of supervision, but the traditional "always been a man's job" is almost ubiquitous.

Procedure for filling senior posts

Formulators were asked a series of detailed questions about the methods used in making appointments to four kinds of senior posts: senior managerial; office supervisory; works supervisory; sales supervisory.

First, they were asked whether they promote within the establishment or within the firm, or whether they appoint from outside.

Many formulators say that more than one method of appointment may be used, so the following answers are not mutually exclusive.

	Senior managerial %	*Office supervisory* %	*Works supervisory* %	*Sales super*visory* %
Promote within establishment	62.2	70.7	73.2	46.7
Promote within firm but outside establishment	44.3	30.3	21.4	28.0
Appoint from outside	47.4	41.7	28.8	29.2

*Not all establishments have such posts.

The most marked consistent differences between the sample groups are in the percentages who make internal promotions.

The kinds of establishments where internal promotions are more likely to be made are those with 500 or more employees and those where equal pay has not been introduced (we show elsewhere that equal pay is more likely to have been introduced in smaller establishments, which is a probable explanation of the latter finding).

Internal promotions are less likely to be made where there are 250 or more women employees or 50% or more women. The differences are particularly marked in the latter case. This appears to indicate that women are less likely to be considered suitable candidates for promotion.

Establishments in the Northern region are consistently less likely to make internal promotions.

Promotions can only be made within the firm but outside the particular establishment if the establishment is part of a larger organisation. Therefore the variations in the percentages who promote inside the establishment are not accompanied by consistent variations in the percentages who promote within the firm or who appoint from outside.

When asking questions about the procedures adopted, establishments where promotions are made within the *establishment* and those where promotions are made within the *firm* have been treated as a single group, so as to eliminate duplication. The percentages who do one or the other or both are as follows:

	%
Senior managerial post	83.2
Office supervisory post	83.2
Works supervisory post	76.4
Sales supervisory posts	54.2

Promotion within firm or establishment

The promotion procedures described by those who promote within the establishment and/or firm are as follow:

	Senior manage-rial %	*Office super-visory* %	*Works super-visory* %	*Sales super-visory* %
Procedure				
Person is selected by management	44.5	52.1	47.5	37.2
Advertisement within establishment or firm	36.0	31.9	22.0	23.4
Trained for promotion, then selected by management	7.7	3.5	7.3	4.3
Natural progression, deputy usually chosen	6.1	3.8	6.4	4.3
Regular staff appraisal	3.3	2.9	2.6	2.6
Management development programme	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.6
Trial period in post	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.6
Promotion board, committee, for suitable applicants	.7	4.9	1.9	–
Vague, no specific procedure	9.6	13.1	12.8	29.9
Other procedures	5.0	3.3	6.6	3.6
Would a woman be considered				
Yes - conditions same	59.9	67.4	42.5	58.8
Yes - but pay would be less	12.9	14.0	12.6	8.5
Yes - but pension would be different	3.8	3.1	2.4	2.4
Yes - difference not stated	–	2.4	.5	2.1
Total saying yes	76.7	86.9	58.0	71.8
No	23.3	10.9	42.0	28.2
Don't know, not stated	–	2.2	–	–
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	1.00	100.0

Some of the answers beg the question. For example advertising within the establishment does not explain how the selection is made from those who apply. However, it is evident that the final selection in the majority of cases for all kinds of job is made by management. An interesting sidelight here is the finding that comparatively few organisations have a systematic approach towards staff appraisal and developing those who show potential. The percentage who do so is consistently higher in the Northern region.

The finding that the percentage of establishments where a woman would be considered for a senior managerial post is higher than those where she would be considered for either a sales supervisory or works supervisory post is somewhat unexpected. This finding is common to all the sample groups but the difference is negligible among establishments where 50% or more of the employees are women. The percentage where a woman would be considered for a works supervisory post is well above the average in this group.

The following table includes some other noteworthy findings. For example, establishments where the policy formulator is in favour of equal pay are less likely than others to consider appointing a woman to each of the four types of post.

Establishments in the engineering industry would be more likely than those in the textiles etc. group to consider a woman for a senoir managerial post, though less likely to consider her for a works supervisory post.

The percentages of establishments filling posts by internal promotion who formulators say would consider women are as follows in the sample groups.

	Senior managerial %	*Office supervisory* %	*Works supervisory* %	*Sales supervisory* %
All establishments making internal promotions	75.7	86.5	56.3	68.2
Total number of employees				
249 or less	75.1	87.8	53.4	68.4
250-499	69.2	81.1	55.7	57.0
500 or more	85.4	90.2	64.4	83.1
Number of women				
99 or less	65.8	80.7	42.7	55.7
100-249	85.5	95.5	73.4	84.6
250 or more	87.0	86.8	71.7	83.9
Percentage of women				
9% or less	58.4	70.1	29.7	37.7
10-24%	78.4	84.4	41.9	60.2
25-49%	86.1	96.0	68.2	75.0
50% or over	79.6	94.4	79.7	86.5
Equal pay introduced				
Yes	74.1	82.8	63.9	69.2
No	85.1	93.5	52.6	71.8
No women doing same work	57.6	74.4	53.7	58.1
Industry group				
Food etc manufacture	82.5	87.7	59.6	56.8
Engineering	82.5	85.2	43.1	58.3
Textiles, etc.	63.8	71.9	59.3	60.2
Transp. & communication	(75.4)	(96.8)	(55.6)	(100.0)
Commerce etc.	(64.1)	(97.2)	(77.8)	(89.7)
Distribution	(94.1)	(100.0)	(84.0)	(91.7)
Broad region				
Central	64.4	90.2	40.2	66.3
Northern	78.4	84.2	64.3	75.3
Southern	84.5	93.4	59.3	61.3
Formulator's attitude to E.P.				
In favour of E.P.	72.3	84.4	53.3	65.8
Others	85.4	92.8	63.9	75.3
Formulator's discrimination index				
In favour of: all three aspects	87.0	91.4	60.4	75.0
any two	67.4	86.2	44.5	65.5
any one	72.3	78.3	67.5	60.5
none	(90.9)	(95.6)	(58.1)	(87.5)

Some of these findings are perhaps surprising, notably the differences between establishments where equal pay has and has not been introduced and where the formulator is and is not in favour of equal pay.

Appointments from outside

The procedures of those establishments which *appoint from outside* are as follows (These are based on all who appoint from outside for each post. The first three answers were prompted).

	Senior manage-rial	*Office super-visory*	*Works super-visory*	*Sales* super-visory*
Procedure				
Notify Department of Employment	37.2	47.3	53.2	33.3
Notify private agency	27.5	39.6	37.0	37.5
Advertise	78.7	88.7	81.2	4.2
Use management consultants	4.3	1.4	.6	3.5
Personal contact	3.1	12.6	3.9	3.5
Approach people in other firms	3.9	2.7	1.3	2.1
Refer to register for the industry	1.2	–	–	–
Other means	6.2	2.7	2.6	15.9
Qualifications specified				
Specific job experience	32.2	31.1	36.4	21.5
Experience (unspecified)	24.4	18.0	24.0	34.0
Academic, technical qualifications	51.2	37.4	42.2	35.4
Appropriate skills	4.3	.5	3.9	4.2
General education level	7.0	8.1	6.5	9.0
Other qualifications	2.7	1.8	2.6	3.5
None specified	16.7	23.9	5.8	24.3
Whether sex specified				
Yes - man	18.9	14.0	25.4	11.4
Yes - woman	–	.5	–	–
Yes - varies according to type of job†	7.4	3.6	5.8	4.2
Yes - varies according to sex of labour force†	5.0	1.8	1.3	–
Yes - varies according to length of hours†	4.7	.9	1.3	1.4
Yes - varies for other reasons†	2.7	1.4	1.9	2.1
No	62.9	74.3	60.9	74.1
Not answered	2.3	4.4	5.9	6.8

*Not all establishments have these posts.
† Some formulators named more than one of these.

There is not a great deal of difference between the procedures adopted for the first three types of post. Methods for sales supervisors differ slightly.

Exact comparability with internal promotions cannot be made because the circumstances are not the same. We can however, take as a fairly similar standard of discrimination those who do not specify sex in the initial stages of appointing outside.

The numbers in many sub-groups are too small to justify detailed analysis and no consistent patterns can be discerned. The most marked differences are those between industries, particularly in the case of senior managerial posts, where the percentages who do not specify sex range from 12.9% in commerce etc. to 100.0% in transport and communication.

Whether a woman would ever be considered

Formulators from establishments making appointments by internal promotions were asked, in cases where it was said a woman would not be considered for a post, what are the reasons. Their reasons, expressed as percentages of all who make internal promotions, are as follows:

	Senior managerial %	*Office supervisory* %	*Works supervisory* %	*Sales supervisory* %
No women with suitable qualifications	8.8	5.8	15.1	12.8
Employees dislike women supervisors	2.9	.7	3.8	1.3
Traditionally a man's job	2.0	.7	1.2	1.6
Women can't handle men	1.6	–	3.8	3.3
Work unsuitable for women	1.3	.2	11.1	2.6
Customers, outside people, would dislike	.2	–	–	3.6
Union difficulties	–	–	2.4	–
Other reasons	4.6	3.5	3.5	5.9

Formulators from establishments making internal promotions who give the reason 'no women with suitable qualifications' were asked whether a suitably qualified woman would be considered if she applied. Those from establishments which appoint from outside who specify the male sex in their procedures were asked a similar question.

If we add these to the percentages who have already said they would consider women for each type of appointment we obtain the following percentages of formulators who say they would consider women under certain circumstances.

	Senior managerial %	*Office supervisory* %	*Works supervisory* %	*Sales supervisory* %
Internal promotion	80.7	92.0	63.3	77.6
External appointment	88.4	86.0	78.6	92.4

This series of findings gives much food for thought and leads to some important conclusions.

Discrimination against the appointment of women to senior positions is by no means overt. The advertisement which specifies that a man is required for a job is only the tip of the iceberg. Egalitarians have attacked this type of advertisement and its prohibition is one measure currently being considered in connection with anti-discrimination legislation, but its eradication would not eliminate the innate opposition which exists in the minds of many managers.

In only minorities of establishments do the management openly admit that they would not consider women for appointments even if suitably qualified. Nevertheless, the minute proportions of women in senior positions is evidence that, in the words of the White Paper

> 'the pattern of inequality is too pervasive and entrenched to be changed by the gradual process of voluntary initiative.'

Chapter XI

Aspects of employee performance

Introduction

In a small sample covering widely differing establishments no useful information could have been obtained by asking questions about the performance of men and women on specific jobs. Apart from sampling considerations the numbers of men and women doing identical or broadly similar work are very small indeed in many industries, so that comparisons would not produce meaningful findings.

There are, however, aspects of performance which are common to all jobs and a number of questions dealt with with these.

The questions began with a "forced-choice" between the performance of men and women in relation to specified aspects. Formulators and implementers were then asked an open question about the *kinds* (not the sex) of workers most liable to sickness absence, followed by another "forced choice" question between the performance of different kinds of workers of the same sex.

In addition to the findings in respect of these questions, we have included in this section some relevant answers given by other individuals at the same establishments. These figures are not based on statistically valid samples and must therefore be regarded purely as giving indications (see Introduction).

In considering the findings in respect of formulators and implementers it is necessary to remember that these people are for the most part representative of management, sometimes of very senior management. Some may be talking from personal experience, others may be expressing the views of boards of directors who have little or no experience of what actually goes on in a factory or shop. Nevertheless, all the opinions expressed are valuable because they show the attitudes with which any anti-discrimination measures might be met.

Comparisons between the performance of men and women

The first question comparing the performance of men and women required formulators and implementers to say which they think are better in general, men or women, at several aspects of job performance which are common to all kinds of jobs. Their answers are as follows:

	Formulators	Implementer
Better at:	%	%
Being punctual		
Men	18.6	31.0
Women	19.4	14.6
No difference	54.6	48.4
Don't know	7.4	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0
Working hard		
Men	9.0	12.0
Women	14.2	15.7
No difference	68.8	68.1
Don't know	7.9	4.2
Total	100.0	100.0
Working conscientiously		
Men	5.9	11.1
Women	26.2	26.3
No difference	62.0	58.0
Don't know	5.9	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0
NOT taking days off for sickness		
Men	46.7	52.7
Women	9.2	5.3
No difference	39.1	39.2
Don't know	5.0	2.7
Total	100.0	100.0
NOT taking days off for other reasons		
Men	47.2	47.3
Women	12.9	10.0
No difference	31.7	36.1
Don't know	8.1	6.5
Total	100.0	100.0
Staying with one firm		
Men	40.4	43.6
Women	15.3	15.5
No difference	37.8	37.6
Don't know	6.5	3.3
Total	100.0	100.0
Carrying out instructions		
Men	10.1	13.0
Women	19.9	17.8
No difference	62.7	63.9
Don't know	7.2	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0
Working safely		
Men	14.6	21.7
Women	34.1	24.5
No difference	37.5	43.8
Don't know	13.8	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0

It should be borne in mind that these are comparisons and that saying that one sex is better than the other does not necessarily imply that the other is bad (or that the better is good).

Except for punctuality, where formulators and implementers differ, majority opinion is the same among both. However, implementers are, in every case, more likely to say they think men are better.

A sizeable number of formulators and implementers think there is no difference between the sexes in respect of each aspect of job performance. In some cases these constitute as much as a two-thirds majority of those who express an opinion.

It is not possible in many cases to say how far beliefs are in accordance with facts. For example, conscientiousness can only be subjectively assessed and there are no statistics in existence to show to what extent instructions are carried out by men and women. The Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories does not analyse industrial accidents by sex, so there is no possibility of comparing the incidence of accidents among men and women.

Comparisons can be made between the answers given by men and women in the other groups of individuals interviewed. With the reservations already stated, these can be taken as giving an indication of the extent to which opinions of relative performance are justified.

a) Time off during past year (employees only)

	Women	*Men*
(Base: employees interviewed)	*(444)* %	*(539)* %
Cause of absence		
None	17.3	28.4
Sickness (own)	64.4	57.0
Accidents at work	5.4	5.4
Family sickness	19.8	9.5
Strikes	2.9	8.2
Lay-offs	7.0	5.2
Unpaid holiday	11.0	7.8
Other causes	3.8	6.2
Days lost from all causes		
None	17.3	28.4
1–5	32.0	30.6
6–10	15.3	11.7
11–20	18.7	12.1
21 & over	16.7	17.2
Total	100.0	100.0
Average number of days	10.6	10.0

The belief that women are more likely to take time off for sickness and for other reasons receives some support from these figures, but the average number of days lost through all causes does not differ greatly between men and women.

b) *Length of time with present employer* (employees and managers)

	Employees		*First-line managers*		*Second-line manager*	
	Women	*Men*	*Women*	*Men*	*Women*	*Men*
(bases: all interviewed)	(444)	(539)	(66)	(294)	(18)	(286)
Length of time	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than 6 months	9.0	6.7	–	–	(–)	–
6 months – 11 months	9.7	7.8	4.5	2.7	(11.1)	3.5
1 year – 1 year 11 months	12.4	8.3	3.0	1.7	(5.6)	3.5
2 years – 4 years 11 months	30.6	26.7	16.7	13.3	(–)	15.0
5 years – 9 years 11 months	20.7	17.8	22.7	19.7	(11.1)	15.7
10 years or more	16.9	31.9	53.0	62.2	(72.2)	62.2
Not stated	.7	.8	–	.3	(–)	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Although women have, on average, been working for a shorter period for their present employers, this does not, of itself indicate that they are less stable, because the break in many women's working lives means that their working years are fewer and that lower percentages in the top age groups have been able to accumulate 10 years' service or more. Differences between the sexes in any one group are less than those between employees and managers of the same sex. On the basis of length of employment at present establishments, formulators and implementers are to some extent confirmed in their opinions.

c) *Number of jobs during the past ten years* (employees, shop stewards, managers)

Possibly a better criterion of job stability is the number of jobs at which informants have worked during the past ten years. Not all those interviewed were working ten years ago: some (both men and women) were in full-time education, while some women were at home. The following comparison is therefore *confined to those who were working outside the home ten years ago.*

	Employees		*Shop stewards*		*First-line managers*		*Second-line managers*	
	Women	*Men*	*Women*	*Men*	*Women*	*Men*	*Women*	*Men*
(Bases: all working ten years ago)	(213)	(407)	(26)	(169)	(52)	(262)	(16)	(267
Number of jobs	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
One	34.7	41.3	(50.0)	55.6	67.3	68.3	(81.2)	64.0
Two	28.2	25.3	(23.1)	20.1	17.3	15.6	(12.5)	24.0
Three	22.1	17.4	(26.9)	11.2	9.6	10.3	(6.3)	6.4
Four	7.0	6.4	(–)	5.9	3.8	2.3	(–)	4.1
Five or more	8.0	9.1	(–)	7.1	1.9	3.4	(–)	1.5
Not stated	–	.5	(–)	–	–	–	(–)	–
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average number	2.4	2.2	(1.8)	2.0	1.6	1.6	(1.3)	1.6

At "shop-floor" level women appear slightly more mobile than men, although the same is not true at higher levels. Again, the difference between managers and employees of the same sex is far greater than that between the sexes in the same group.

There is evidence from other sources that, on average, women are not less stable employees than men(1), and that older women in particular are likely to remain in one job for a long time. There is also evidence that absenteeism is more closely associated with job status than with sex. Since the level of women's jobs is, on average, considerably lower than that of men it is not surprising that their absenteeism record is not so good as that of men.

Attitudes of sample groups

So far we have attempted to relate some opinions on performance to the actual situation. Here we compare the opinions of formulators and implementers in the different sample groups.

None of the groups in the samples are entirely consistent in their attitudes, but there are some which are almost so.

Not unexpectedly, those formulators and implementers who have been classed as non-discriminators and those in favour of equal pay almost consistently include a higher percentage of answers favourable to women and/or of those saying there is no difference. The exception among non-discriminators is in the case of "staying with one firm and not moving from one to another". Formulators and implementers from establishments where equal pay has been introduced are almost consistent in including higher percentages who believe there is no difference.

More highly educated formulators and implementers are almost consistently more favourably disposed towards women workers.

No pattern can be discerned among formulators and implementers from different industries, particularly in the light of the small numbers of informants in most groups. A few highlights are given as a matter of interest.

In the transport and communications group none of the formulators is prepared to say men are more punctual than women and 17.4% think women are more punctual. On the other hand, among implementers 25.3% think men are more punctual, compared with 8.0% who think women are. This is given as a striking example of the differences of opinion which can exist between those who help to make policy and those who carry it out. In distribution there is a different kind of disagreement: no formulators or implementers think women are more punctual than men, but whereas 55.6% of implementers think men are more punctual, only 16.7% of formulators do so.

Another example of disagreement occurs in the transport and communications group. No formulators, compared with 32.0% of implementers, believe men to work more safely than women, and 40.6% of formulators, compared with 17.3% of implementers, believe women to work more safely.

Formulators and implementers in commerce are more nearly in agreement in the case of taking days off for sickness, where not one of either think women are better in this respect. Even here, however, there is some disagreement: 64.1% of formulators, compared with 40.6% of implementers, think there is no difference.

---

(1) *A Survey of Women's Employment* by Audrey Hunt HMSO 1968; *Labour Mobility in Great Britain* by Amelia Harris HMSO 1966.

Overall comparison of men's and women's performance

If we apply the simple test of adding together for each industry the percentages thinking men are better and those thinking women are better at each aspect of job performance, we obtain the following totals:

	Formulators		*Implementers*	
	Men %	*Women* %	*Men* %	*Women* %
Food etc. manufacture	171.3	196.4	167.2	183.5
Engineering etc.	198.5	176.2	239.0	144.9
Textiles etc.	229.7	153.4	238.7	123.0
Transport and communication	175.3	137.6	200.0	138.6
Commerce etc.	137.6	142.3	223.6	111.0
Distribution	176.1	63.1	337.0	50.1
All industries	192.5	151.2	233.3	128.5

It should be remembered that a high score for men does not necessarily imply a low score for women, and vice versa, because there is always the possibility of a high score for "no difference". The highest possible score is 800% in each instance, and nowhere do the scores of either men or women reach half that figure. If we adopt the rather crude yardstick of total percentages as a measure of overall work performance, it can be said that the percentages who believe that, taken as a whole, the performances of men and women are on a par with each other outnumber those who favour one sex or the other.

Another feature of these figures is the very low rating given to women's performance in the distributive trade. It should be remembered that this survey was confined to establishments with 100 or more employees and that the women who work in such establishments are for the most part in the junior non-manual socio-economic group, including a high proportion of part-timers.

The views of those from establishments employing a high percentage or a large number of women are important, because their influence can affect the conditions of large numbers of women. Both formulators and implementers from establishments with a high *percentage* of women employees are more likely to favour men for punctuality, for not taking days off for sickness or other reasons and for working safely. On the other hand there is a marked trend from lower to higher percentages of women in the percentages of formulators and implementers who think women work harder than men.

Formulators and implementers from establishments with high *numbers* of women are more likely to favour men for punctuality and safety, and women for conscientiousness and carrying out instructions. It is interesting that they are less likely to favour men for staying in one job.

Other ways in which men are better workers than women

After having asked informants to say which sex were better in respect of a number of selected attributes of work performance, we asked them to say whether they think there are any other ways in which men are better workers than women and vice versa.

The percentages who say there are other ways in which one or other of the sexes excel are as follows:

		Formulators		*Implementers*	
		Yes-men	*Yes-women*	*Yes-men*	*Yes-women*
		%	%	%	%
All informants		48.7	54.1	38.9	51.1
Age	39 & under	54.8	54.8	40.0	51.7
	40 – 54	46.1	53.3	36.4	52.7
	55 & over	51.2	57.3	42.0	48.1
Terminal education age	15 & under	45.5	55.3	36.6	62.5
	16 – 18	48.6	51.4	35.8	38.0
	19 & over	55.2	61.2	54.2	59.7
Attitude to E.P.	For	43.8	49.9	40.3	51.4
	Others	64.1	67.2	32.3	49.5
Discrimination	For: all three aspects	33.8	53.5	39.8	55.7
	any two	39.3	46.9	34.5	40.9
	any one	69.9	58.0	46.3	58.8
	none	(71.7)	(76.1)	(30.3)	(57.6)
Total employees	249 or less	47.2	51.9	35.5	51.8
	250 – 499	57.7	56.9	39.7	46.3
	500 or more	41.7	57.3	48.5	55.7
Number of women	99 or less	42.7	55.0	37.8	45.7
	100 – 249	60.8	49.2	39.1	58.7
	250 or more	42.3	64.4	43.5	54.9
Percentage of women	9% or less	57.5	61.9	59.1	49.1
	10 – 24%	42.2	56.9	43.1	47.2
	25 – 49%	27.6	32.7	28.2	35.4
	50% & over	57.2	58.1	31.0	61.6
Equal pay introduced	Yes	51.3	50.8	36.8	41.6
	No	45.1	54.9	35.4	56.2
	None doing same work	53.1	58.2	45.5	60.2
Industry	Food, etc. manufacture	(57.6)	(45.8)	(29.5)	(57.4)
	Engineering	32.1	51.1	43.7	50.8
	Textiles, etc.	45.5	62.4	35.7	54.2
	Transport & communication	(75.4)	(76.8)	(42.7)	(36.0)
	Commerce etc.	(48.4)	(28.1)	(14.1)	(48.4)
	Distribution	(55.6)	(46.3)	(72.2)	(59.3)
Broad region	Central	43.0	49.3	39.9	49.3
	Northern	52.6	61.0	36.6	56.8
	Southern	46.0	42.5	46.1	42.6

The attributes selected for comparison evidently did not cover by any means all those in which the performance of men and women are believed to differ. It appears that the selected attributes excluded more of those in which women excel than of those in which men excel.

Many of the differences in the foregoing table are not statistically significant and there is no wholly consistent pattern of responses. (One which is significant is that between the percentages of implementers who say respectively that there are ways in which women excel and that there are ways in which men excel.) In a majority of cases, the percentage who think there are other ways in which women are better workers exceeds the percentage who think there are other ways in which men are. This is true of both formulators and implementers. In most groups the percentage of formulators who think there are other ways in which men are better workers exceeds the percentage of implementers who do so. In the case of women there is no such consistency.

Any comment on these figures must therefore be confined to findings which are perhaps unexpected or to pinpointing those differences which, although isolated, may be useful from the point of view of policy.

It is perhaps surprising that among formulators not in favour of equal pay the percentage who think there are other ways in which women excel considerable exceeds the percentage of those in favour. This is not paralleled among implementers.

An important finding is that 61.6% of implementers in establishments where 50% or over of the employees are women think there are other ways in which women excel, compared with 31.0% giving this reply in respect of men.

It is perhaps surprising that in establishments where equal pay has not been introduced implementers are more likely to say there are other ways in which women excel than are implementers where equal pay has been introduced. This percentage is also considerably higher than the percentage who think there are other ways in which men excel.

Most of the analyses show that there is less difference between formulators' answers in respect of men and women than there is between implementers' answers in the same group and that differences in answers are in the same direction. That is, if formulators are more likely to give answers favourable to women, implementers are also more likely to do so. However, the industrial analysis shows no such uniformity. The numbers in many of the industrial groups are small, so this may be a consequence of chance sampling variations, although some of the individual differences are statistically significant.

If the views of the formulators are translated into action, it is a good sign that in the engineering industry and in textiles etc. the percentages of formulators who give answers favourable to women greatly exceeds the percentages who give answers favourable to men.

Details of the other ways in which men are considered to be better workers than women and vice versa are as follows: (these are based on all informants so as to enable their relative importance to be assessed).

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
Other ways in which men are better		
At heavy work, rough jobs.	19.2	15.6
More responsible, reliable	9.4	12.0
Less emotional	4.2	4.5
Can work longer hours, do shift work	7.0	2.0
Better at making decisions	6.5	2.0
Mentally quicker, cope better with new ideas	3.2	1.6
Better at concentrating	2.0	2.6
Better at specific jobs	1.1	1.1
Other ways	11.3	6.9
Total ways mentioned	63.9	48.5
Vague answers, don't know	3.1	2.7
No other ways	51.5	61.6
Other ways in which women are better		
Get less bored, more patient at repetitive jobs	30.1	33.0
Greater manual dexterity	26.4	15.5
Waste less time, get on with the job	5.2	4.9
More attention to detail, more accurate	5.5	3.9
Better at specific jobs	2.0	4.7
Tidier, cleaner in their work	4.1	3.3
More sympathetic, tactful	–	3.6
More imaginative, creative	.6	2.7
Work more quickly	1.1	2.0
Mentally quicker	.6	1.1
More loyal	1.1	–
Other ways	3.0	4.5
Total ways mentioned	79.7	79.2
Vague answers, don't know	.6	1.1
No other ways	45.9	48.2

Not only do higher percentages of formulators and implementers say there are other ways in which women are better than men as workers, but those who say so name more ways. However, it is little comfort to equalitarians to know that the leading way in which women are considered better is that they are less likely to get impatient with dull work.

Manual dexterity can be offset against physical strength, but usually the latter is rated more highly in terms of financial rewards.

For the most part these answers are merely repetitions of statements that have been bandied about for many years. It is impossible to say whether they are given as a result of personal experience or are simply expressions of opinion based on nothing more than hearsay.

Sickness absence

Evidence exists (e.g. from studies in the Civil Service) that sickness absence is more a function of grade of worker than of sex. Since women's jobs for the most part are at a lower level than men's it therefore follows that women are more likely to have sickness absence than are men.

Formulators and implementers were asked whether, from their experience at the selected establishment, any kinds of employees are more liable than others to sickness absence. At this point it was emphasised that it was the *kind* of employee, not the sex in which we were interested. Informants were then asked, within each kind of worker, whether men or women were more liable to sickness absence.

(By asking the questions in this way informants were prevented from answering "women in general", but those holding that view had already been able to express it in answer to an earlier question.)

The form of question asked produced the useful information that majorities of formulators and implementers are unable to name any kinds of workers who are more liable than others to sickness absence.

The percentages in the sample groups who are unable to name any kinds of workers are as follows:

		Formulators	*Implementers*
		%	%
All formulators/implementers		61.7	57.2
Age	39 & under	41.7	46.7
	40 – 54	70.1	63.4
	55 & over	55.9	52.3
Terminal education age	15 & under	67.1	62.9
	16 – 18	55.0	52.5
	19 & over	69.8	58.0
Attitude to E.P.	For	58.5	59.6
	Others	70.7	48.9
Discrimination index	For all three aspects	61.3	54.7
	For any two	57.8	57.1
	For any one	61.5	55.9
	For none	(78.0)	(85.0)
Total number of employees	249 or less	68.4	69.3
	250 – 499	54.3	34.9
	500 or more	49.0	49.0
Number of women	99 or less	63.9	64.0
	100 – 249	58.6	53.3
	250 or more	59.1	38.9
Percentage of women	9% or less	77.0	76.9
	10 – 24%	61.4	56.4
	25 – 49%	44.0	45.5
	50% & over	61.8	53.6
E.P. introduced	Yes	63.5	63.6
	No	57.9	52.0
	None doing same work	69.4	69.4

		Formulators	*Implementers*
		%	%
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	(67.8)	(31.1)
	Engineering	54.2	52.4
	Textiles, etc.	61.9	58.8
	Transport & communication	(85.5)	(66.7)
	Commerce etc.	(56.3)	(70.3)
	Distribution	(48.2)	(64.8)
Broad region	Central	71.2	61.6
	Northern	61.0	58.9
	Southern	51.4	47.8

There is no perceptible pattern in the responses of either formulators or implementers. Nor do the differences between sample groups follow the same lines for formulators and implementers.

The most that can be deduced from these figures is, that apart from a few isolated instances, a majority of both formulators and implementers admit to ignorance of the differences, if any, between the sickness records of employees of different kinds. They show much less reluctance to differentiate between men and women in respect of sickness absence when asked in earlier and later questions to do so. Perhaps this is an example of the tendency to blame the type of person who is easily identified. A similar type of approach is seen in the attitudes of some people to women drivers or to black people.

The kinds of workers described as being most liable to sickness absence are as follows:

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
Kinds of workers most liable to sickness absence		
None in particular	61.7	57.2
Managerial, professional	2.6	3.3
Office staff	3.9	7.6
Sales staff	.7	2.0
Catering and domestic	.6	4.5
Skilled craftsmen, apprentices	1.9	2.5
Semi skilled manual	2.6	3.4
Unskilled manual	1.5	6.0
Manual (unspecified)	2.6	2.2
"Factory workers"	4.4	6.5
Elderly, older	3.5	3.7
Younger, junior	3.9	5.6
Immigrants	2.6	2.4
Others	8.5	8.2

In order to draw conclusions which would be generally valid it would be necessary to analyse these findings by the combinations of kinds of workers employed. The numbers are too small to render such an exercise useful.

Informants were asked to say, within each type named, which were more liable to sickness absence, men or women.

Obviously no valid information can be derived for individual types of worker. If we add together the figures for all types mentioned we obtain the following:

	Formulators	*Implemente*
(Weighted total)	(212)	(329)
(Unweighted total)	(113)	(151)
More liable to sickness absence	%	%
Men	18.3	14.9
Women	37.3	36.2
Both equal	20.3	19.1
Can't say	5.7	4.0
Only one sex in category	18.3	25.8
Total	100.0	100.0

It can be said that those formulators and implementers who are able to name kinds of workers whose sickness records are worse, are both more likely to believe that women have more sickness absence than men do. These informants constitute only a minority of all formulators and implementers.

In order to find out how far these opinions are based on observed facts, formulators were next asked whether detailed records are kept for the establishment of sickness absence, other absence and labour turnover, by such factors as age, sex and marital status. 46.9% say records are kept, but of these only 19.7% mention sickness absence and 21.8% mention other absence specifically. It therefore seems apparent that, for about half the formulators and implementers their answers must be based on impressions rather than hard facts.

Perhaps unexpectedly, records are more likely to be kept in smaller establishments than in large and in those with less than 100 women employees than in those with larger numbers of women. Industrial differences are comparatively small.

Paired comparisons of opinions of job performance of selected types of workers

After being asked in general terms for their opinions of the relative merits of different types of worker in respect of sickness absence, both formulators and implementers were asked to compare selected pairs of workers in respect of four aspects of work performance, namely, working hard; staying with one firm and not moving from one to the other; NOT taking days off for sickness; NOT taking days off for other reasons.

Ideally we should have put every-possible combination of types of worker to our informants, but there are limits to the endurance of even the most well-disposed informant and we therefore confined the question to within-sex comparisons.

The following points should be borne in mind in considering the following figures.

The finding that one of a pair is better than the other does not necessarily mean that one is good and the other bad.

One comparison cannot be paired with another: for example, 64.2% of formulators think older women are better than younger in respect of working hard, while 50.2% think older men are better than younger. This cannot be taken to mean that older women are better than older men. A legitimate conclusion which could be drawn is that a majority of formulators think older *workers* are better than younger.

This form of question seeks to establish that there are within-sex differences which are recognised by formulators and implementers. This is desirable if only to counter the generalised arguments that one sex as a whole is better or worse than the other.

The answers of formulators and implementers are as follows:

	Working hard		*Staying with one firm*		*NOT taking days off for sickness*		*NOT taking days off for other reasons*	
	Formulators %	*Implementers* %	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %
Believed better								
Younger women	5.4	4.2	.2	.2	8.5	10.5	15.7	14.5
Older women	64.2	65.8	79.9	79.3	62.7	57.2	58.5	56.9
No difference	24.7	26.0	16.2	19.3	23.8	28.7	19.6	25.3
Don't know	5.7	4.0	3.7	1.2	5.0	3.6	6.2	3.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Younger men	16.6	12.2	.7	.6	8.9	8.2	7.2	4.3
Older men	50.2	57.4	79.0	78.4	53.1	53.2	55.2	60.0
No difference	29.2	27.7	17.9	19.1	33.2	33.9	32.1	30.6
Don't know	4.0	2.7	2.4	1.9	4.8	4.7	5.5	5.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Single women	11.4	16.9	15.9	18.3	35.8	28.1	45.6	39.3
Married women	34.3	39.0	46.3	50.8	23.8	30.8	14.6	19.5
No difference	42.8	38.0	28.8	27.0	30.6	36.4	30.8	36.9
Don't know	8.1	6.1	9.0	3.9	9.8	4.7	9.0	4.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Single men	.6	4.9	1.3	1.1	5.5	2.7	7.4	4.2
Married men	43.9	45.0	65.9	66.3	44.1	46.8	45.2	46.2
No difference	47.2	42.4	23.5	27.1	41.5	40.9	38.6	40.0
Don't know	8.3	7.7	9.3	5.5	8.9	9.6	8.8	9.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Part-timers	18.3	18.1	17.5	22.6	8.7	15.7	9.2	12.0
Full-timers	26.4	29.2	40.4	42.1	36.3	38.3	39.3	42.7
No difference	37.3	41.5	20.5	24.7	31.4	34.3	27.9	33.8
Don't know	18.0	11.2	21.6	10.6	23.6	11.7	23.6	11.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unskilled women	2.4	3.4	5.2	10.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.2
Skilled women	30.8	36.5	31.7	37.1	26.0	32.1	27.3	29.8
No difference	35.1	34.9	35.8	30.2	42.8	41.9	39.9	43.0
Don't know	25.1	25.2	27.3	22.0	29.5	24.2	31.0	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The similarity of the opinions of formulators and implementers throughout is striking, the only instance where they diverge slightly is in the comparison between full-timers and part-timers. Possibly some of the formulators are more remote from the day-to-day running of the establishments and therefore feel unable to express an opinion.

It is noteworthy that in almost every comparison the kind of worker considered better in respect of one aspect of performance is also considered better in every other aspect. The only instances where this is not so are in respect of married and single women. A majority think married women better in respect of hard work and stability, while for taking days off the reverse is true.

On the basis of these figures older men and women, married men and women, full-timers and skilled women are believed to give the better performance.

There are some differences between the strength of the views of both formulators and implementers, but these are, in general, not significant and do not follow a consistent pattern. They are accounted for mainly by differences in the percentage who are unwilling to give an opinion or who say there is no difference. The only ones worthy of comment are the following.

Older formulators and implementers (those aged 55 and over) consistently throughout all comparisons are more likely than younger to say that skilled women are better than unskilled. The same is true of more highly educated formulators and implementer

Formulators and implementers who have been classed as non-discriminators are consistently more favourably disposed to part-timers.

Evidence from other individuals at establishments

It is possible to compare the answers given by other individuals in respect of three aspects of job performance. Comparisons are made in the following paragraphs, with the usual proviso that these are indications only.

(The interpretation of "younger" and "older" was left to the informant. We have taken those aged 39 and under as "younger", 40 and over as "older" for the purpose of the following comparisons).

a) *Staying with one firm*

Within-sex comparisons are possible for both sexes only in the case of men and women employees because the numbers of women managers and shop stewards are too small. The following compares the number of jobs held during the past ten years. *(percentages read across).*

			NUMBER OF JOBS						
		*Bases**	*One*	*Two*	*Three*	*Four*	*Five or more*	*Not stated*	*Average number*
			%	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*No*
Women employees	Younger	(63)	20.6	30.2	23.8	11.1	14.4	–	3.0
	Older	(149)	40.9	27.5	20.8	5.4	5.4	–	2.1
	Married	(145)	30.3	29.0	24.1	6.9	9.7	–	2.5
	Single	(38)	47.4	23.7	15.8	7.9	5.2	–	2.1
	Widowed etc.	(30)	40.0	30.0	20.0	6.7	3.3	–	2.0
	Full-timers	(160)	36.3	28.1	20.0	8.1	7.5	–	2.3
	Part-timers	(52)	28.8	28.8	28.8	3.8	9.6	–	2.5
Men employees	Younger	(142)	17.6	25.4	27.5	9.8	19.0	.7	3.0
	Older	(260)	54.6	25.4	11.5	4.6	3.6	.4	1.8
	Married	(357)	42.3	25.5	16.8	5.6	9.3	.6	2.2
	Non-married+	(49)	34.7	24.5	22.4	12.2	6.1	–	2.3

* i.e. those who were working 10 years ago.

+ There are too few widowers to show separately

Thus, the opinions of formulators and implementers are supported by these findings in the case of younger and older men and women. The numbers of single and widowed women are small, so that it would be unwise to regard the indications here as being trustworthy. The figures for women full-timers and part-timers do not bear out the opinions of management.

b) *Days off for sickness and for other reasons during past year.*

Without a complicated analysis which the purpose of this comment would not justify, it is not possible to separate causes of absence (apart from sickness). The following table therefore shows only, for men and women employees, the percentages who have had time off for sickness and for any reason (including sickness).

	Women employees							*Men employees*			
	Younger	*Older*	*Married*	*Single*	*Widowed etc*	*Full-time*	*Part-time*	*Younger*	*Older*	*Married*	*Non-Married*
(Bases: all interviewed)	(243)	(200)	(276)	(128)	(40)	(348)	(96)	(272)	(262)	(399)	(340)
Any time off for	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Sickness	72.0	55.5	64.5	67.2	55.0	66.7	56.3	65.1	48.5	53.9	65.7
Any cause (including sickness)	86.4	78.0	83.0	81.2	85.0	84.5	76.0	79.0	63.7	68.7	80.7

Formulators' and implementers' opinions are supported to a great extent by these findings, except in the case of full-timers and part-timers. Because of the sampling limitations it is not possible to draw firm conclusions, but a study of the job performance of full-timers and part-timers, including aspects other than those covered in the present survey, might reveal that part-time work for women with domestic responsiblities is of positive value to the employer as well as beneficial to the women themselves.

Turnover among women employees

Because of the length of interview, implementers were asked to estimate the percentage annual turnover among *women* employees only. In the following summary, *percentages read across.*

		Less than 5%	*5 – 24%*	*25 – 49%*	*50% & more*	*Don't know*	*Approximate Mean % turnover*	*Approximate Median % turnover*
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All establishments		25.5	43.8	19.3	3.5	7.8	18.2	14.4
Attitude to E.P.	For	28.5	40.6	19.3	2.9	8.7	17.5	13.5
	Others	16.3	59.8	11.9	6.6	5.4	20.1	15.4
Discrimination index	For: all three	19.3	50.0	23.9	2.3	4.5	19.1	16.4
	any two	27.1	38.4	16.3	3.9	14.3	17.8	13.2
	any one	37.5	38.2	17.6	2.9	3.7	15.8	10.6
	none	(–)	(66.7)	(21.2)	(9.1)	(3.0)	(25.1)	(19.5)
Total number of employees	249 or less	30.4	42.9	18.8	1.8	6.1	16.3	12.7
	250 – 499	26.1	39.7	17.6	5.2	11.4	19.9	14.3
	500 or more	12.5	50.0	20.8	6.2	10.5	22.4	17.9
Number of women	99 or less	38.4	33.4	19.5	1.3	7.3	14.9	9.6
	100 – 249	10.9	60.9	16.3	2.7	9.2	19.9	16.2
	250 or more	6.5	43.5	27.4	16.1	6.5	28.9	20.0
Percentage of women	9% or less	51.8	20.9	23.6	.9	2.7	14.1	4.7
	10 – 24%	38.2	43.9	12.2	2.4	3.3	14.1	9.6
	25 – 49%	9.1	49.5	22.2	3.0	16.2	21.3	18.3
	50% & more	12.5	52.8	19.9	5.6	9.2	21.5	17.5
E.P. introduced	Yes	31.4	42.0	10.1	3.7	12.8	15.4	10.8
	No	18.7	47.0	25.4	1.6	7.3	19.3	16.8
	None doing same work	36.2	32.8	20.3	9.1	1.6	21.3	12.9

		Less than 5%	*5 – 24%*	*25 – 49%*	*50% & more*	*Don't know*	*Approximate Mean % turnover*	*Approximate Median % turnover*
		%	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
Industrial groups	Food etc manufac.	18.0	55.7	21.3	3.3	1.6	19.2	16.2
	Engineering etc	46.0	29.4	10.3	3.2	11.1	13.1	4.8
	Textiles etc.	17.9	47.6	25.0	5.4	4.2	21.5	17.6
	Transp. & communication	(34.7)	(37.3)	(28.0)	(–)	(–)	(16.6)	(13.2)
	Commerce etc.	(20.3)	(37.5)	(6.3)	(4.7)	(31.3)	(17.1)	(12.5)*
	Distribution	(3.7)	(68.5)	(24.1)	(1.9)	(1.9)	(21.2)	(18.2)
Broad region	Central	43.5	39.1	13.8	.7	2.9	12.8	7.6
	Northern	22.0	49.8	17.6	2.4	8.1	17.5	14.6
	Southern	13.0	33.9	30.4	9.6	13.1	26.9	22.9

*This median and mean should be treated with special caution because of the high percentage who are unable to estimate the annual turnover.

The principal differences are those between the percentages which have a very low turnover (less than 5%). This percentage is significantly higher in establishments with less than 250 employees, with less than 100 women workers and with fewer than 10% of women (very markedly so in the last instance).

Industrial differences are also pronounced. It is perhaps unexpected that the percentage with a low turnover should be highest in establishments in the engineering industry. The comparatively low percentage in commerce can be partly explained by the very high percentage of implementers who are unable, even with prompting, to give an estimate. The very low percentage with a low turnover in distribution is worth noting.

A possible explanation, at least in part, of the regional differences may be the extent to which alternative employment is available in the area. In addition to the women who would leave for the simple reason that they want to take a better job (whatever their definition of a better job may be), some women who would leave for a job nearer home may not be able to do so in an area where little alternative employment is available.

A majority of establishments with percentage annual turnover of 5% or more have a turnover of between 5% and 24%. This is true of all groups with two exceptions. First of these is that of establishments with less than 10% of women. The explanation here is that the percentage with a turnover of less than 5% is exceptionally high. The second is the Southern region, where the percentage with a turnover of 25% or more is unusally high.

In statistical terms the distribution of the answers in all groups are highly skewed. That is to say, the great majority of answers come in the turnover range of less than 25%. Where this occurs, the mean value of the percentage turnover is apt to be affected by a few establishments with an exceptionally high turnover. The median is therefore a better measure to use for between-group comparisons than is the mean.

In this instance, comparing median values to a great extent reinforces the conclusions derived from a comparison of the percentages of establishments with a very low turnover.

The earlier Women's Employment Survey gave an average of 2.1 jobs in the previous ten years, that is, an average length of service of 4.8 years. Bearing in mind that the earlier survey covered all working women, while the present survey is confined to larger establishments in selected industries, the two sets of figures are in reasonable agreement. Both indicate that a majority of women workers are not unstable employees.

Taken overall, the percentage with an annual turnover of 50% or more is very small. This is true in nearly all groups. Exceptions are those with 250 or more women employees, those where no women are doing the same work as men and those in the Southern region. The last-named may reflect the greater availability of jobs for women in the South.

Variations in turnover

The subsidiary questions on variations in turnover between categories of employees and on the reasons given for leaving were not asked where the implementer is also the formulator. The answers must therefore be taken as indications only.

Apart from the possibly unrepresentative character of those replying, some implementers did not appreciate the fact that if there is a higher than average turnover among some categories there must also be a lower than average turnover among others. Therefore the figure of 62.7% of those who answer the question who say there is no difference between categories is less unreliable than the 25.7% who say some categories have a higher turnover rate or the 9.5% who say some have a lower rate.

The extent to which a particular category of workers can be named depends on the extent to which that category is employed at all. In other words, an implementer from an establishment which does not employ, for example, catering workers cannot name them as having a higher or lower rate of turnover. Virtually all the establishments employ women office staff(1), so it is not surprising that this category of workers receives the highest percentage of mentions both as having a higher and having a lower rate of turnover. In view of the impossibility of analysing all the possible combinations of categories employed, as well as the small numbers involved, it is not justifiable to be more specific.

We have shown earlier that two-thirds of the women employees interviewed and nine-tenths of the women managers state they have worked for two years or more for their present employers. Taken in conjunction with the estimated turnover, this appears to indicate that there are two distinct tendencies among women workers. Some women tend to spend a short time in a lot of jobs, while others remain for long periods in one job. (The same may be true of men, but the present survey does not cover the point).

Reasons given for leaving

The same limitations as for variations in turnover hold true for the reasons given by women for leaving their jobs. These, in total, are as follows:

Reasons	%
Pregnancy	51.5
Moving from area	44.0
Domestic problems	39.4
Dissatisfied with job	24.1
Want better paid job	16.2
Marriage	14.5
Travelling difficulties	10.4
Want different, better homes	9.5
Health reasons	4.6
Retirement	4.1
Other reasons	19.9

Some general conclusions can be drawn from these figures. Women, in the view of their employers, are more likely to leave for personal reasons of one kind or another than with the object of bettering themselves. This may, of course, result from the fact that opportunities of better jobs for women are limited.

Marriage is of far less importance than pregnancy as a reason for leaving a job.

---

(1) This category covers clerks and typists, but not office managers, supervisors or professional and similar staff.

Chapter XII Facilities and fringe benefits

Introduction

The provisions considered in this section are some which fall outside the basic pay and working conditions. They vary widely in their nature and scope. Many of them are at present applicable almost entirely to women, although in a completely non-discriminatory society it would be reasonable for most of them to apply to men. For example, retraining of women returning to work after several years' absence is only one facet of the general question of re-training in a rapidly changing technological society.

Therefore, although we deal with most of these provisions in the light of their usefulness to women, the possibility of their usefulness to men should not be disregarded.

Other provisions are applicable to both sexes (e.g. sick pay, pensions).

Background information about women workers

In order to obtain some idea of the extent of the possible demand among women for provisions of different kinds, implementers were asked if they could give an estimate of the proportions of women workers at the establishment who are married, who have children of school age and who have children of pre-school age (this was one of the questions which had to be omitted for reasons of time when the functions of formulator and implementer were combined).

Because of the comparatively small number who were asked this question it is not justifiable to analyse the answers in detail. The following are the answers in total.

	Women employees who:		
	Are married	*Have school-age children*	*Have pre-school children*
(Unweighted bases)	(111)	(111)	(111)
	%	%	%
Proportion of full-timers			
All or nearly all	7.5	2.1	–
About three quarters	49.6	4.3	1.1
About one-half	27.5	16.4	.4
About one-quarter	9.6	36.4	21.8
None	–	8.6	33.9
Don't know, not answered	5.7	32.1(1)	42.8(1)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Proportion of part-timers			
All or nearly all	59.3	15.4	1.4
About three-quarters	14.3	5.0	4.6
About one-half	2.5	11.1	3.6
About one-quarter	.7	16.8	12.1
None	.4	13.9	38.9
Don't know, not answered(3)	22.9	37.8(2)	39.3(2)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

(1) Some of these, who are unable to give the ages of children of full-time women, give the following percentages with children of unknown ages: all or nearly all 4.3%; three-quarters .4%; one quarter 7.9%;

(2) Similar percentages for part-time women are: all or nearly all .7%; three-quarters 2.9%; one half 3.2%; one quarter .4%;

(3) These figures include establishments which do not employ part-time women workers.

According to an earlier survey(1) the following percentages of women workers are married and have children of different ages.

	Full-time workers %	*Part-time workers* %
Women who are:		
Married	48.1	88.5
Responsible for:		
Child(ren) aged 0 – 2	2.4	7.2
Child(ren) aged 3 – 4	2.1	9.0
Child(ren) aged 5 – 15	15.2	47.5
Child(ren) of any age	17.7	53.8

A straightforward comparison cannot be made between these figures and those from the present survey, because the former are based on women workers and the latter on establishments. Nevertheless the indications are the same in both cases, namely, that sizeable proportions of the female labour force, particularly of part-timers, have responsibility for children.

A finding from the present survey is that, even allowing for those establishments which do not employ part-time women workers, very many implementers are ignorant of the extent of the family responsibilities of the women who work at their establishments. It probably follows that they cannot be fully aware of the possible effects of personnel policy on the well-being of women employees. Thus they would be unlikely to be able to estimate, for example, the magnitude of the possible demand for child-care facilities at the work place.

According to the earlier survey 63.7% of full-time working women and 97.4% of part-timers were housewives, i.e. they had the responsibility for running a household in addition to doing their outside job.

Less detailed information is available about men's domestic responsibilities. It has been estimated that there are about 100,000 lone fathers of dependent children(2). Also there are about 80,000 men of working age whose wives are too severely handicapped to carry out domestic tasks(3).

Facilities provided at establishments

Both formulators and implementers were asked to say which of a number of facilities are provided by the firm. The reason for asking both the same question was in order to ask subsequently which facilities in their opinion are most successful in improving the performance of men and of women employees at the establishment.

Theoretically, in the ideal situation, the answers given by formulators and implementers should have completely coincided. In practice, however, this is not entirely the case. In the first place, as stated in the introduction, we were unable in a few instances to interview both formulator and implementer at one establishment. Secondly, formulators and implementers did not always give identical answers and as we had no means of deciding which answer was correct we had to accept both. Thirdly, owing to the weighting which had to be used to restore true proportions a small difference has occasionally been magnified. It may also be possible that, although the policy of a large combine may be to introduce a facility, that policy may not have been implemented at that establishment.

---

(1) *A Survey of Women's Employment* by Audrey Hunt (HMSO 1968) tables A.2 and E.2.

(2) *Report of Finer Committee on one-parent families,* (HMSO 1974),

(3) *Handicapped and Impaired in Great Britain* by Amelia Harriss (HMSO 1971).

SOUTHAMPTON LIBRARY UNIVERSITY

There are some differences in the percentages of formulators and implementers who name certain facilities in answer to this question and those who say in answer to other specific questions that these facilities are provided. This applies to part-time work, flexible hours, paid sick leave and paid maternity leave. The explanation probably lies in the well-established fact that using a different form of words to ask what is, in essentials, the same question will often produce different answers. In the present instance it seems likely that the question under discussion has been interpreted in general terms and answered accordingly. For example, at an earlier stage 87.9% of implementers said that part-timers were employed and that 58.2% of establishments employing them allowed part-timers some flexibility of hours. In answer to the present question 76.1% say the firm provides part-time work and 31.2% that it provides flexible hours. This possibly indicates that some implementers have overlooked part-timers who are not employed in the main business of the establishment (e.g. part-time cleaners). They may also have thought of flexible hours in terms of general policy, not in terms of its applicability to certain groups of workers at the establishment.

These differences do not appear likely to invalidate the general conclusions from this question, but it would probably be unwise to use the findings as a basis for quantitative estimates, particularly in the cases where differences of the kinds described above are known to exist.

According to formulators virtually none and according to implementers very few establishments provide none of the facilities. There are, however, some differences in the groups between the statements of formulators and implementers. According to formulators the average number provided is 3.2 and according to implementers 3.0. The pattern is very similar for both. According to both the average number is particularly low in establishments with less than 25% of women and in establishments where no men and women are doing the same work.

The following comments apply to the findings from this question only.

As the following tables show the only differences which are not explicable by the small differences in the samples are flexible hours and child care facilities. They do not invalidate the general conclusions. The figures for these two facilities should not, however, be used as the basis for quantitative estimates.

Part-time work. The percentage of establishments offering part-time work increases with the total number of women employed. It is significantly lower in establishments with less than 10% women and higher in food manufacturing than in most other industrial groups. Regional differences are small.

Flexible hours. About one-third of all establishments offer flexible hours. Differences in general are not significant and there is no evidence of a trend with increasing numbers or percentages of women employees. In the case of the transport and communications group the percentages naming this facility differ and therefore should be treated with caution. It is noteworthy that in the commerce group the percentage is considerably lower than in other industrial groups, though the differences are not always significant.

Opportunities for shopping. Roughly one-sixth of establishments provide opportunities for shopping. The percentage is highest of all in distribution, possibly because employees are given facilities in the establishment where they work. It is almost non-existent in transport etc.

Child care facilities. We have said that the figures here are suspect. Even if we accept the higher figure given by formulators it is evident that this facility is provided by very few establishments. As in the case of flexible hours, it is in the transport and communications group that the statements of formulators and implementers differ most widely. If the formulators' statements are accepted the transport and communications group are best in this respect, but if the implementers' figures are accepted this facility is not provided at all.

Paid maternity leave. Here the overall figures for formulators and implementers are much the same, (about one in 20 say it is offered), but there are some differences between the answers given by formulators and implementers in some groups, so that it would be unwise to base firm conclusions on individual figures, particularly in view of the answers given by implementers to another question on the subject.

Among establishments where equal pay has been introduced the percentage providing paid maternity leave is higher than in establishments where equal pay has not been introduced. Paid maternity leave is little in evidence in the manufacturing industries and non-existent in distribution. It is also non-existent in the Central region.

Job guarantee after maternity. The percentage who offer and the pattern are much the same as for paid maternity leave. This is not surprising, because paid leave implies a return. Some establishments guarantee a job after maternity where they do not offer paid leave and a few do not guarantee the job after paid maternity leave (possibly because a woman returning after maternity leave may have to take other work if her old job is not available.)

Training for better jobs. According to both formulators and implementers this is provided by eight out of ten establishments. According to both formulators and implementers, transport and communications establishments include a high percentage with job training facilities. In food etc. manufacturing their answers differ. According to formulators establishments in this industry are better than those in most other industries, according to implementers they are the worst. According to both formulators and implementers the Central and South have a better record in this respect than the Northern region.

Paid sick leave. Formulators and implementers agree that this is provided by over 80% of establishments. There are no apparent trends according to total number of employees or total number of women but there is a marked downward trend with increasing percentages of women employees. Textiles etc., where formulators and implementers both say sick pay is provided in a little over 60% of establishments, is the worst of the industrial groups.

FORMULATORS

Facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

	Total	*Total number of employees*			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
		249 or less	*250 –499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100– 249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10– 24%*	*25– 49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	155	39
Facilities provided	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work	76.4	71.5	83.8	82.3	70.2	82.3	89.8	54.0	75.9	89.8	82.3	73.0	84.3	62.2
Flexible hours	40.4	37.7	52.3	33.3	38.7	48.1	25.4	43.4	31.0	43.0	42.8	43.4	43.1	27.6
Opportunities for shopping	17.9	18.7	16.2	17.7	18.9	13.3	27.1	12.4	9.5	23.5	22.8	21.7	16.9	13.3
Child care facilities	4.8	1.9	12.3	4.2	1.3	11.6	1.7	2.7	.9	5.1	7.9	9.5	1.6	4.1
Paid maternity leave	4.4	4.7	2.3	–	7.9	–	–	15.9	2.6	3.1	–	9.5	1.2	3.1
Job guarantee after maternity	4.6	6.0	3.1	2.1	7.6	–	3.4	2.7	1.7	6.1	6.5	7.1	2.7	3.1
Training for better jobs	81.9	83.5	83.1	75.0	82.5	80.7	83.1	87.6	79.3	82.7	80.0	93.7	74.5	78.6
Paid sick leave	84.9	84.8	84.6	85.4	85.8	84.0	83.1	92.0	84.5	86.7	80.5	87.3	85.5	78.6
None of these	.6	.3	–	2.1	.7	–	1.7	.9	.9	–	.5	.5	.8	–
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Average number provided	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.1	2.7

FORMULATORS

Facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by industry and broad region)

		Industry group						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
	Total	*Food etc*	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc.*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc.etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
All formulators (base for percentages	*542*	*59*	*131*	*165*	*69*	*64*	*54*	*142*	*287*	*113*
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
Facilities provided	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work	76.4	(91.5)	78.6	75.8	(60.9)	(79.7)	(72.2)	81.7	72.1	80.5
Flexible hours	40.4	(35.6)	48.1	39.4	(55.1)	(12.5)	(44.4)	47.2	35.2	45.1
Opportunities for shopping	17.9	(13.6)	9.9	16.4	(–)	(31.3)	(53.7)	23.2	11.1	28.3
Child care facilities	4.8	(1.7)	1.5	2.4	(24.6)	(1.6)	(–)	2.1	6.0	4.4
Paid maternity leave	4.4	(5.1)	–	1.8	(8.7)	(18.8)	(–)	–	4.2	10.6
Job guarantee after maternity	4.6	(1.7)	1.5	2.4	(8.7)	(18.8)	(–)	–	5.2	8.8
Training for better jobs	81.9	(86.4)	76.3	78.8	(95.7)	(79.7)	(85.2)	83.8	79.4	85.8
Paid sick leave	84.9	(94.9)	87.0	67.3	(95.7)	(96.9)	(94.4)	91.5	82.9	81.4
None of these	.6	(–)	.8	1.2	(–)	(–)	(–)	.7	.7	–
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Average number provided	3.2	(3.4)	3.0	2.8	(3.5)	(3.4)	(3.5)	3.3	3.0	3.4

IMPLEMENTERS

Facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249 more*	*250 or less*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	99	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Facilities provided														
Part-time work	76.1	71.9	80.9	82.8	71.2	80.9	85.5	43.6	81.3	84.8	85.6	74.6	83.9	60.2
Flexible hours	31.2	28.1	42.6	25.3	27.2	37.5	32.3	14.5	28.5	37.4	38.4	28.6	35.4	26.1
Opportunities for shopping	17.0	19.5	13.2	14.1	18.5	10.9	27.4	6.4	20.3	13.1	22.2	16.2	20.5	8.0
Child care facilities	.7	–	2.2	1.0	–	1.6	1.6	.9	2.4	–	–	1.6	.4	–
Paid maternity leave	5.5	5.8	8.8	–	6.0	6.5	–	–	2.4	3.0	11.1	14.6	1.2	–
Job guarantee after maternity	6.4	5.1	11.8	3.0	5.6	6.5	9.7	–	1.6	3.0	13.9	13.5	2.8	3.4
Training for better jobs	79.6	78.0	81.6	81.8	76.8	81.5	87.1	88.2	80.5	79.8	74.5	82.7	81.9	63.6
Paid sick leave	82.7	82.4	77.9	89.9	86.1	80.4	72.6	92.7	85.4	84.8	75.0	87.0	81.9	75.0
None of these	1.6	.3	4.4	2.0	1.7	1.1	3.2	2.7	1.6	1.0	1.4	1.1	1.2	4.5
Not stated	.7	–	2.9	–	1.0	.5	–	–	3.2	–	–	–	1.6	–
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Average number provided	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.2	2.5	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.4

(1)Establishments where no formulator was interviewed are omitted

IMPLEMENTERS

Facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food etc	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Facilities provided										
Part-time work	76.1	91.8	71.4	76.2	(58.7)	(93.8)	(72.2)	73.2	74.9	82.6
Flexible hours	31.2	31.1	36.9	39.9	(24.0)	(12.5)	(27.8)	40.6	22.0	43.5
Opportunities for shopping	17.0	16.4	4.8	19.6	(4.0)	(20.3)	(51.9)	19.6	13.6	22.6
Child care facilities	.7	–	–	2.4	(–)	(–)	(–)	–	1.0	.9
Paid maternity leave	5.5	4.9	–	1.8	(16.0)	(18.8)	(–)	–	8.1	5.2
Job guarantee after maternity	6.4	1.6	4.0	3.0	(16.0)	(18.8)	(–)	.7	10.2	3.5
Training for better jobs	79.6	68.9	77.8	76.2	(97.3)	(78.1)	(83.3)	90.0	73.9	81.7
Paid sick leave	82.7	96.7	81.0	63.7	(94.7)	(98.4)	(94.4)	84.8	82.4	80.9
None of these	1.6	–	1.6	4.2	–	–	–	2.9	1.7	–
Not stated	.7	–	2.4	.6	–	–	–	.7	.3	2.6
Average number provided	No. 3.0	No. 3.1	No. 2.7	No. 2.8	No. (3.1)	No. (3.4)	No. (3.3)	No. 3.1	No. 2.9	No. 3.2

Effectiveness of facilities

Formulators and implementers were asked to say which of the facilities provided by establishments they believe to be most effective in improving the work performance of men and women. The question implies a comparison of facilities and the answers obviously depend on which facilities are provided. The possible combinations of facilities are almost limitless, so the tables which follow are based on all formulators or all implementers and should be interpreted as showing what percentage of all establishments have found each facility most effective in improving performance (many informants named more that one facility as being equally effective).

By this criterion both formulators and implementers put training for better jobs in the leading position for men and for women. This is true of all the sample groups in respect of men, but in some sample groups, notably in commerce and the Central region, the provision of part-time work is considered of greater importance in the case of women. In asking this question differences in the provision of facilities for men and women were not investigated. Training and sick pay schemes were examined in some detail and we show elsewhere that there are differences between the sexes in some establishments.

Obviously a facility cannot improve the performance of people to whom it is not available and we therefore show below the percentages of formulators and implementers who name each facility who think this facility effective in improving performance. (The limitation described above also applies in the case of these figures. Facilities named by only a few are omitted).

		Facility			
		Part-time work	*Flexible hours*	*Training*	*Paid sick leave*
Percentage of those mentioning each who think it improves performance the most		%	%	%	%
Formulators:	of men	1.2	11.4	66.7	27.0
	of women	36.0	46.6	38.3	25.9
Implementers:	of men	.7	2.3	68.6	28.9
	of women	30.9	46.8	40.8	20.9

These figures further emphasise the importance of training for both men and women.

It is interesting to see that the percentages of formulators and of implementers who think no facilities are effective in improving performance are almost the same for men and women (27.1% and 28.4% for men and women given by formulators; 22.6% and 23.7% respectively by implementers). These greatly exceed the percentages who provide no facilities, so it appears that there are some managements who look upon these provisions in the light of an attraction to people to come to work for them and not as something which will encourage better performance. The percentages of these disillusioned employers are highest for both men and women in the commerce industrial group.

FORMULATORS

Effectiveness of facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	155	39
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work														
Effective for men	.9	–	1.5	3.1	.3	1.1	3.4	–	1.7	1.0	.9	–	1.6	1.0
Effective for women	27.5	28.4	33.8	15.6	26.2	25.4	40.7	10.6	24.1	34.7	34.9	28.0	25.4	31.6
Flexible hours														
Effective for men	4.6	3.8	8.5	2.1	3.6	7.7	–	2.7	6.0	3.1	5.6	7.9	2.7	3.1
Effective for women	18.8	16.1	32.3	9.4	15.2	27.6	8.5	7.1	19.0	26.5	21.4	23.8	19.2	8.2
Opportunities for shopping														
Effective for men	.4	–	–	2.1	–	.6	1.7	–	–	1.0	.5	–	–	–
Effective for women	8.5	9.8	10.0	2.1	11.3	4.4	6.8	5.3	3.4	14.3	10.2	12.7	5.9	7.1
Child care facilities														
Effective for women	.4	–	.8	1.0	–	.6	1.7	–	–	1.0	.5	.5	.4	–
Paid maternity leave														
Effective for women	4.1	5.7	2.3	1.0	7.3	–	–	3.5	5.2	12.2	–	8.5	1.2	3.1
Job guarantee after maternity														
Effective for women	4.4	6.0	2.3	2.1	7.3	–	3.4	2.7	.9	6.1	6.5	7.9	2.4	3.1
Training for better jobs														
Effective for men	54.6	50.0	65.3	54.2	49.0	60.8	64.4	53.1	55.2	48.0	58.1	55.5	54.1	54.1
Effective for women	31.4	27.2	34.6	39.6	25.2	34.8	60.6	32.7	37.1	27.6	29.3	33.9	32.2	24.5
Paid sick leave														
Effective for men	22.9	23.4	27.7	15.6	21.9	24.9	11.9	21.2	19.8	18.4	27.4	38.1	14.9	14.3
Effective for women	22.0	21.5	26.9	16.7	20.2	24.3	23.7	17.7	18.1	19.4	41.4	36.0	17.3	7.1
None of these														
Effective for men	27.1	30.4	23.1	21.9	31.5	19.3	28.8	35.4	12.1	37.8	26.0	28.6	26.7	25.5
Effective for women	28.4	32.0	27.7	17.7	34.8	20.4	20.3	38.9	18.1	36.7	24.7	31.7	27.8	23.5

FORMULATORS

Effectiveness of facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by industry and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food etc	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Sou ern*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work										
Effective for men	.9	(1.7)	1.5	.6	(–)	(1.6)	(–)	2.1	.7	–
Effective for women	27.5	(37.3)	29.0	18.2	(29.0)	(28.1)	(38.9)	43.0	19.2	29.2
Flexible hours										
Effective for men	4.6	(1.7)	3.8	2.4	(–)	(4.7)	(22.2)	1.4	7.0	2.7
Effective for women	18.8	(16.9)	25.2	10.9	(29.0)	(6.3)	(31.5)	23.9	15.7	20.4
Opportunities for shopping										
Effective for men	.4	(–)	.8	–	(–)	(1.6)	(–)	.7	.3	–
Effective for women	8.5	(1.7)	2.3	10.9	(–)	(26.6)	(11.1)	8.5	7.0	11.5
Child care facilities										
Effective for women	.4	(–)	–	1.2	(–)	(–)	(–)	–	.3	.9
Paid maternity leave										
Effective for women	4.1	(–)	–	1.8	(10.1)	(18.8)	(–)	–	4.5	8.0
Job guarantee after maternity										
Effective for women	4.4	(1.7)	.8	2.4	(8.7)	(18.8)	(–)	–	4.9	8.8
Training for better jobs										
Effective for men	54.6	(59.3)	56.5	50.9	(55.1)	(31.3)	(83.3)	51.4	54.7	58.4
Effective for women	31.4	(27.1)	22.9	38.2	(46.4)	(6.3)	(46.3)	16.2	41.1	25.7
Paid sick leave										
Effective for men	22.9	(10.2)	19.1	17.6	(49.3)	(23.4)	(27.8)	19.0	28.2	14.2
Effective for women	22.0	(5.1)	16.0	19.4	(47.8)	(23.4)	(27.8)	14.1	29.3	13.3
None of these										
Effective for men	27.1	(33.9)	21.4	33.3	(34.8)	(28.1)	(3.7)	29.6	28.6	20.4
Effective for women	28.4	(27.1)	30.5	28.5	(43.5)	(32.8)	(–)	33.8	27.5	23.9

IMPLEMENTERS

Effectiveness of facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced (1)*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	548	313	136	99	302	184	62	110	123	97	216	185	254	88
Unweighted figures	222	64	75	83	101	74	47	38	66	50	68	57	115	37
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work														
Effective for men	.5	–	1.5	1.0	.3	.5	1.6	–	.8	–	.9	–	1.2	–
Effective for women	23.5	26.5	23.5	14.1	24.8	23.9	16.1	11.8	22.8	33.3	25.5	25.9	21.3	30.7
Flexible hours														
Effective for men	.7	–	1.5	2.0	.7	1.1	–	–	2.4	–	.5	.5	.8	–
Effective for women	14.6	12.1	25.0	8.1	11.6	19.0	16.1	.9	14.6	25.3	16.7	14.6	18.5	4.5
Opportunities for shopping														
Effective for men	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Effective for women	8.6	10.9	8.1	2.0	11.6	3.8	8.1	2.7	4.1	10.1	13.4	10.8	9.1	3.4
Child care facilities														
Effective for men	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Effective for women	.4	–	.7	1.0	–	.5	1.6	–	–	1.0	.5	.5	.4	–
Paid maternity leave														
Effective for women	2.9	4.8	–	1.0	5.3	–	–	2.7	–	3.0	5.6	7.0	1.2	–
Job guarantee after maternity														
Effective for women	2.9	5.1	–	–	5.3	–	–	–	.8	3.0	5.6	6.5	1.6	–
Training for better jobs														
Effective for men	54.6	49.2	61.0	62.6	54.6	53.3	58.1	66.4	61.0	51.5	46.3	56.2	59.8	35.2
Effective for women	32.5	32.6	24.3	43.4	34.1	28.3	37.1	54.5	38.2	27.3	20.4	29.2	39.0	21.6
Paid sick leave														
Effective for men	23.9	30.0	19.1	11.1	23.2	31.0	6.5	21.8	17.9	15.2	32.4	36.2	17.3	18.2
Effective for women	17.3	21.4	14.0	9.1	19.9	17.9	3.2	15.5	17.1	12.1	20.8	28.1	14.2	2.3
None of these														
Effective for men	22.6	26.8	15.4	19.2	27.5	14.1	24.2	20.9	8.9	36.4	25.0	25.4	20.5	25.0
Effective for women	23.7	27.8	17.6	19.2	25.8	21.7	19.4	17.3	15.4	29.3	29.2	22.2	26.0	22.7

(1) Establishments where no formulators was interviewed are omitted.

IMPLEMENTERS

Effectiveness of facilities provided by firm for employees in establishment (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food etc	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Sou ern*
All implementers WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	552	61	126	168	75	64	54	138	295	115
Unweighted figures	222	31	73	68	17	14	19	71	88	63
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Part-time work										
Effective for men	.5	–	.8	1.2	(–)	(–)	(–)	2.2	–	–
Effective for women	23.5	37.7	31.7	19.6	(9.3)	(23.4)	(20.4)	41.3	14.9	24.3
Flexible hours										
Effective for men	.7	–	2.4	.6	(–)	(–)	(–)	2.9	–	–
Effective for women	14.6	14.8	20.6	12.5	(16.0)	(6.3)	(14.8)	26.1	7.5	19.1
Opportunities for shopping										
Effective for men	–	–	–	–	(–)	(–)	(–)	–	–	–
Effective for women	8.6	4.9	2.4	9.5	(–)	(18.8)	(24.1)	13.8	5.8	9.6
Child care facilities										
Effective for men	–	–	–	–	(–)	(–)	(–)	–	–	–
Effective for women	.4	–	–	1.2	(–)	(–)	(–)	–	.3	.9
Paid maternity leave										
Effective for women	2.9	–	–	1.8	(1.3)	(18.8)	(–)	–	4.4	2.6
Job guarantee after maternity										
Effective for women	2.9	–	.8	1.8	(–)	(18.8)	(–)	–	4.1	3.5
Training for better jobs										
Effective for men	54.6	42.6	58.7	54.8	(66.7)	(56.3)	(38.9)	49.3	56.9	54.8
Effective for women	32.5	24.6	38.9	39.9	(41.3)	(7.8)	(20.4)	29.0	38.3	21.7
Paid sick leave										
Effective for men	23.9	31.1	18.3	19.6	(30.7)	(23.4)	(35.2)	29.0	26.8	10.4
Effective for women	17.3	8.2	11.9	17.3	(20.0)	(20.3)	(33.3)	19.6	20.3	7.0
None of these										
Effective for men	22.6	24.6	13.4	25.0	(21.3)	(40.6)	14.8	19.6	23.1	25.2
Effective for women	23.7	13.1	20.6	22.6	(22.7)	(59.4)	5.6	19.6	27.1	20.0

ensions schemes at selected establishments Formulators were asked whether there was a firm's pensions scheme or schemes at the establishment.

The percentages of establishments at which there are any pensions schemes are as follows.

		%
All establishments		92.8
Number of employees	249 or less	89.6
	250 – 499	98.5
	500 or more	95.8
Number of women	99 or less	93.7
	100 – 249	90.1
	250 or more	96.6
Percentage of women	9% or less	100.0
	10 – 24%	94.8
	25 – 49%	84.7
	50% or more	91.6
E.P. introduced	Yes	87.8
	No	96.5
	None doing same work	92.9
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	100.0
	Engineering	97.7
	Textiles etc.	81.8
	Trans. & commun.	(100.0)
	Commerce etc.	(95.3)
	Distribution	(94.4)
Broad region	Central	93.0
	Northern	95.1
	Southern	86.7

These figures should not be regarded as providing the basis for national estimates. A number of industrial groups were excluded from the sample and in some of these (national and local government, for example) there are pensions schemes which are almost universal. In others (the building and construction industry, for example) pensions schemes are comparatively rare.

Detailed questions were not asked where one person combined the functions of formulator and implementer. Their answers can therefore be described only in general terms.

In about one-third of the establishments covered by the subsidiary questions there is more than one pension scheme. Where there is more than one scheme the differentiation is almost always between categories of workers ("staff" and manual, for example).

The two tables which follow are *based on the scehmes about which details were obtained* and must therefore be treated with caution.

Formulators who were asked whether schemes were contributory and whether they applied to both sexes. They described them as follows:

	All schemes described
Weighted base	(337)
Unweighted base	(137)
	%
Scheme is:	
Non contributory	29.1
Contributory and voluntary	19.0
Contributory and compulsory	42.7
Contributory and compulsory after a time	9.2
Total	100.0
For men only	14.2
For women only	3.3
For both sexes	78.9
Not stated	3.6
Total	100.0

The actual number of schemes for one sex only are too few for detailed examination.

On the basis of these figures, it seems that women are seldom explicitly excluded from pensions schemes. Their exclusion may be implicit by virtue of the fact that there are no women in the categories covered.

As can be seen from the following, it is in the conditions of the schemes that sex differences become apparent (the first four differences were prompted)

	Pensions schemes applicable to both sexes
(Weighted base)	(266)
(Unweighted base)	(122)
	%
Differences in conditions	
Admission to scheme *	30.8
Contributions	10.5
Retirement age	62.8
Amount of pension in relation to pay	4.1
Widow's benefit	6.4
Other ways	3.0
No differences	16.5

* 14.7% said the *maximum* age for admission is lower for women than for men; 9.0% said the *minimum* age for admission is higher for women than for men.

Where there are differences in conditions formulators were asked the reasons for the differences. In 49.0% of cases they say the different State retirement age is responsible, in 8.6% they mention the high turnover in female staff, in 1.5% they blame women's greater longevity and in 20.2% formulators do not know the reason.

It would be unwise to base firm conclusions on such small numbers in a sub-sample, but it is evident that there is some measure of differentiation in the majority of schemes. There are also indications that equalisation of the State retirement age for the sexes might have beneficial results.

Government proposals current at the time of writing would provide for equal treatment for the sexes, including in State Schemes, but not for equalisation of retirement age.

Sick pay schemes

Both formulators and implementers were asked whether the firm had a sick pay scheme or schemes at the establishment. (This is another instance where their answers differ).

		Sick pay scheme(s) according to:	
		Formulators	*Implementers*
		%	%
All		93.9	87.8
Number of employees	249 or less	94.3	84.7
	250 – 499	93.0	90.4
	500 or more	93.8	93.9
Number of women employees	99 or less	94.7	88.7
	100 – 249	93.9	87.0
	250 or more	89.8	85.5
Percentage of women employees	9% or less	97.3	90.0
	10 – 24%	97.4	99.2
	25 – 49%	99.0	99.0
	50% or more	87.9	75.0
E.P. introduced	Yes	99.5	83.2
	No	92.2	91.7
	None doing same work	87.8	83.0
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	98.3	98.4
	Engineering etc.	96.2	90.5
	Textiles etc.	83.6	75.0
	Transport and communications	(100.0)	(100.0)
	Commerce etc.	(100.0)	(81.3)
	Distribution	(100.0)	(100.0)
Broad region	Central	95.8	89.9
	Northern	92.7	84.1
	Southern	94.7	94.8

According to both formulators and implementers sick pay schemes are less likely to exist where the number and percentage of women employees are highest.

Formulators were asked how many sick pay schemes there were and were also asked for details about all schemes. These questions were omitted where one person combined the functions of formulator and implementer, so the following findings must be regarded as indications only.

In about three-quarters of the establishments covered by the question there was one scheme only.

The main descriptions of the categories covered by individual schemes are as follows:

Categories	%
All	31.4
All staff (i.e. as distinct from manual or hourly)	27.5
Particular category or categories of staff	23.7
Managers, foremen, supervisors	19.9
All manual workers	15.3
Particular category or categories of manual or hourly	19.8

All-embracing schemes are much rarer in the engineering group than in other industrial groups and, conversely, different schemes for "staff" and manual workers are much commoner.

No schemes are said to be confined explicitly to one sex, but in about 8% of schemes the amount of sick pay is explicitly dependant on sex. In about three-fifths of schemes it is dependant on seniority, which may possibly be disadvantageous to women.

Maternity leave arrangements

All implementers were asked whether the firm has any of a prompted list of arrangements for maternity leave. Their detailed answers are as follows:

Maternity leave arrangements	*All implementers* %
Paid leave for some women at least (1)	10.6
Formal unpaid leave for some women at least (1)	8.6
Informal arrangements (2)	23.4
Must leave, job held open	1.5
Other arrangements	2.6
Need has never arisen	26.6
No maternity leave	29.9
Not stated, don't know	2.0

(1) See text for fuller explanation.

(2) This includes answers such as "it would be considered on an individual basis".

It is evident that comparatively few firms have any formal arrangements for maternity leave, even for unpaid leave.

It was not possible, for reasons of time, to follow up the question of which women were eligible for paid and unpaid maternity leave. Implementers who did not combine this function with that of formulator were asked whether all women were eligible: the indications are that in about half these establishments only some women were eligible. Only the same implementers were asked about the factors which are taken into account when deciding whether to grant maternity leave on an informal basis. Their answers indicate that many of these arrangements are made on an ad hoc basis without predetermined criteria. It also appears possible that in some cases pregnancy may be used as an excuse for getting rid of a woman employee who is not regarded by management as satisfactory.

There is some duplication between the first three types of arrangements listed in the table, but this amounts to no more than 5% in all and the indications are that this is merely another way of saying that different arrangements apply to different groups of women. 6.4% have paid leave arrangements only, 4.6% unpaid leave only and 21.9% have informal arrangements only.

Groups where the percentage who provide paid leave for *any* women greatly exceed the average are as follows: where equal pay has been introduced (25.9%); in the transport and communications industry (40.0%); in the commerce etc industry (26.6%) (the last two percentages should be treated with caution). The percentage is well below average in the following groups: where equal pay has not been introduced (2.4%); where the implementer is not in favour of any aspect of equality (nil); in establishments with 10–24% of women (1.6%); in the food manufacturing industry (nil); in engineering (3.2%); in textiles etc (2.4%); in the central region (.7%).

The percentage who grant no maternity leave at all does not consistently follow the opposite pattern to those who do provide it, partly because the answer "the need has never arisen" is often higher when the percentage who say no maternity leave is granted is lower. Possibly many of those who say the need has never arisen give this answer in justification of a lack of policy, because it appears unlikely that not one of their women employees has ever become pregnant. A further complication is that the percentage who mention informal arrangements is frequently higher when one or other or both of these percentages is lower, and vice versa.

It can legitimately be concluded that very few firms in the industries covered by the survey have a systematic approach to the question of maternity leave.

Where there are any maternity leave arrangements, formal or informal, these apply equally to both married and unmarried women in 88.9% of establishments which operate them. The numbers in the different groups are too small for differences to be significant. Comparatively few (5.8%) say the arrangements definitely would not apply equally to married and unmarried women.

Implementers were asked whether women taking advantage of the maternity leave arrangements retain certain rights. The percentage where rights are retained are as follows:

	Establishments with:		
	Formal paid leave	*Formal unpaid leave*	*Informal arrangements*
(Unweighted bases)	(16) %	(17) %	(70) %
Rights retained to:			
Seniority	(91.4)	(93.6)	61.7
Eligibility for sick pay	(96.6)	(95.7)	53.9
Eligibility for paid holiday	(96.6)	(93.6)	75.0
Eligibility for pension	(91.4)	(91.5)	50.0
None of these	(1.7)	–	7.8

In spite of the small numbers the differences between establishments with formal leave (whether paid or unpaid) and those with informal arrangements are statistically significant, except in the case of paid holidays. The right to paid holidays nowadays is extended to a great many employees after comparatively short periods of service, so the exception is not surprising.

Implementers from establishments which do not give paid maternity leave were asked whether the question has ever been considered by management or raised by trade unions. 2.3% say it has been considered by management and 2.5% that it has been raised by trade unions.

The general conclusions regarding paid maternity leave are that it is rarely in operation and that where it is not in operation it has more rarely been even considered.

Women returning after several years at home

As yet comparatively few women return to work while their children are below school age. The earlier survey (1) showed that only 4.3% of working women were responsible for children aged 0 – 2 years and only 4.6% for children aged 3 – 4 years. It follows that a majority of women will have a break of at least five years in their employment. With the rapid technological changes which have been made in many industries these women are likely to be at a disadvantage when they return. Implementers were therefore asked what provisions are made for retraining a woman who returns after several years' absence. Their answers are as follows:

Provisions made	%
She is treated as a new entrant	24.8
She is given a refresher course	23.9
No training because previous experience sufficient	19.7
Conditional answers (depends on job, on woman herself, on amount of experience etc)	8.4
Other specific answers	1.3
Would need to be reacclimatised	2.6
Need has not arisen	9.6
No provisions made	3.8
Don't know, not answered	5.9
Total	100.0

Thus, in one-quarter of establishments a woman's previous experience is not taken into account. This virtually means that in these establishments a woman has to start all over again.

"No training because previous experience sufficient" can be taken in two ways. Either it can be taken to mean that a skill or qualification once gained is never lost, or else that the level of work is such that little or no training is needed.

Even if we assume that conditional answers include provision for re-training where desirable, and that reacclimatisation includes a certain amount of retraining, it appears that in only 34.9% of establishments is there a positive approach to the question of re-entry to the work force.

(1) Op. cit. table E.1

The following table shows, for each sample group, the percentages who, for a woman who had previously worked for the firm in the same job, would

(a) *treat her as a new entrant*

(b) *give her a refresher course*

(c) *give no further training because not necessary*

		(a) %	(b) %	(c) %
All establishments		24.8	23.9	19.7
Attitude to E.P.	For	25.6	23.5	18.0
	Others	17.4	27.2	32.6
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	35.2	13.6	13.6
	any two	22.7	28.1	19.2
	any one	17.6	36.0	22.8
	none	(12.1)	(3.0)	(42.4)
Total number of employees	249 or less	19.2	24.9	19.5
	250 – 499	22.8	25.7	18.4
	500 or more	45.5	18.2	22.2
Number of women employees	99 or less	17.9	24.5	20.2
	100 – 249	30.4	22.3	20.1
	250 or more	41.9	25.8	16.7
Percentage of women employees	9% or less	20.0	34.5	18.2
	10 – 24%	26.0	16.3	22.0
	25 – 49%	30.3	16.2	21.2
	50% or more	24.1	26.4	18.5
E.P. introduced	Yes	13.8	22.3	25.5
	No	26.8	24.2	17.1
	None doing same work	42.9	20.3	19.2
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	(57.4)	(27.9)	(3.3)
	Engineering etc.	34.9	19.0	28.6
	Textiles etc.	19.6	29.8	20.8
	Transp. and communication	(9.3)	(22.7)	(17.3)
	Commerce etc.	(4.7)	(20.3)	(23.4)
	Distribution	(25.9)	(18.5)	(13.0)
Broad Region	Central	17.4	31.9	29.0
	Northern	22.7	25.0	16.3
	Southern	39.1	11.3	17.4

The following differences between the percentages of establishments where returning women employees are treated in the same way as new entrants are statistically significant.

The percentage is higher in establishments where the implementer is a non-discriminator than in those where he is not. This appears in some ways to be a surprising finding, because one might expect a non-discriminator to have a positive approach to the question of re-entrants. On the other hand, the implementer may not have a direct influence on policy, particularly in an instance such as this, where the opinions of first and second line management may carry more weight.

The percentage is lower in establishments with less than 250 employees than in those with 500 or more. It is also lower in establishments with fewer than 100 women than in those with 100 or more. Possibly this indicates that in smaller establishments it is easier to identify and make special arrangements for re-entrants with appropriate experience.

In establishments where equal pay has been introduced the percentage is lower than in either those where it has not been introduced or those where not women are doing the same work as men (the first difference is barely significant). It seems likely that a progressive attitude towards equal pay may accompany an enlightened approach to women re-entrants.

Industrial differences are very marked. The individual differences are not all highly significant but are sufficiently so to say that the situation in food manufacturing is less favourable than in the remaining manufacturing industries. This is accompanied in food manufacturing by a significantly lower percentage where no training is given because it is not necessary. The implications of this are that women returning to the food manufacturing industry are more likely to lose the benefits of any earlier training they may have received.

The difference between the percentage in distribution and the other non-manufacturing industries, although quite marked, is not highly significant statistically.

Manufacturing industries taken together include a higher percentage who treat re-entrants in the same way as new entrants than is the case in non-manufacturing industries. This is to a great extent accounted for by the much higher percentages in non-manufacturing industries who give conditional answers.

The differences between the Central and Southern regions are also significant, particularly that between the higher percentage in the Central and the lower percentage in the Southern who give refresher courses.

Implementers from establishments which take previous experience with the same firm into account were asked whether similar experience with another firm would also be taken into account. 38.3% of these (17.4% of all implementers) say it would. 8.4% (3.8% of all implementers) say it would not. The remainder give conditional answers.

Implementers who say that relevant experience elsewhere is taken into account were asked whether a woman with experience of a different job would be treated as a new entrant. 80.6% (20.3% of all implementers) say she would.

Policy when children are ill

Information from an earlier survey (1) showed that 82.0% of working women said they were allowed time off when their children were ill (it was not possible at that time to investigate further the conditions under which they were allowed time off).

This information was obtained from working women themselves. In order to obtain an idea of management policy in this respect, implementers were asked:

> "Does this establishment have any formal policy about time off for mothers whose children are ill or who have other problems connected with their children?"
>
> If no: "what usually happens when children are ill?"

Their answers are as follows:

Policy	*All establishments* %
Formal paid leave	2.9
Formal unpaid leave	7.8
Formal policy, but each case treated on its merits	5.1
Other policy	4.2
Total with formal policy	20.0
No formal policy	79.0
Not stated	1.0
Total	100.0
What usually happens where there is no formal policy?	
Paid leave	6.0
Unpaid leave	30.3
Time off allowed (unspecified)	3.4
Staff allowed paid leave, hourly paid allowed unpaid leave	1.8
Each case is treated on its merits	21.2
Other answers	8.1
Need has never arisen	7.6
Not stated	.5

Comparatively few establishments have formal arrangements, but there is no evidence that time off is actually refused. The comparatively high percentage who say each case is treated on its merits (whether formally or informally) may indicate that leave may sometimes be refused or that paid leave is granted more often than the figures indicate.

Most of the differences between groups in the extent to which *formal* arrangements exist are comparatively small, but those between establishments with different numbers of women employees and between industries are worth noting.

(1) op. cit. p. 99

		Formal arrangements			
		Paid leave	*Unpaid leave*	*Merits*	*Other*
		%	%	%	%
All establishments		2.9	7.8	5.1	4.2
Number of women	99 or less	4.9	8.2	3.0	1.6
	100 – 249	.6	5.7	6.8	1.1
	250 or more	–	11.1	9.7	22.0
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	(–)	(16.4)	(8.2)	(6.6)
	Engineering etc.	2.4	14.9	1.6	1.6
	Textiles etc.	.6	5.3	2.3	2.3
	Transport and commun.	(16.0)	(–)	(5.3)	(16.0)
	Commerce etc.	(–)	(1.6)	(1.6)	(1.6)
	Distribution	(–)	(7.4)	(22.2)	(–)

The comparatively high percentage who have formal arrangements of one kind or another in establishments with 250 or more women may arise from the need to regularise a situation which may occur quite frequently.

The differences between industries do not form any explicable pattern. Perhaps the most striking deviation from the average is in the case of commerce, where the percentage who have any kind of formal arrangement is much lower than elsewhere.

Chapter XIII

Protective legislation, working hours and shift working

Laws regulating the employment of women

Demands for equality of treatment in employment for both sexes are frequently countered by the argument that the laws regulating women's employment are so restrictive that it is impossible to consider women for promotion, training or putting them on the same work as men.

Implementers were therefore asked the direct question:—

> "Do you find the laws regulating women's work cause difficulties in employing them to the best advantage?"

The percentage answering "Yes" in each of the sample groups are shown in the table on the following page.

The percentage of all implementers who find the laws cause difficulties is comparatively small, but the percentage in some of the sample groups is much higher.

It is significantly higher among implementers in establishments with 500 or more employees than among those in establishments with less than 250. It is also higher among those in establishments employing more than 249 women than among those in establishments employing less than 100.

An interesting feature is the difference between implementers in establishments with 25 – 49% women employees and those in establishments with lower and higher percentages of women. This group includes a much higher percentage of implementers who find the laws cause difficulties. There are indications elsewhere that this particular group differs from both those with lower and those with higher percentages of women employees (e.g. in the much higher percentages of formulators and implementers who think it would be a good thing if more women were trained for skilled work). It may be that where the numbers of men and women are fairly evenly balanced the difficulties caused by the law are more apparent. For example, if both are employed in the same workshop and restrictions prevent women from working overtime it might be useless to ask men to work overtime. If almost all the employees are men this circumstance would not arise and if almost all the employees are women the operations as a whole would be geared to meet the laws' requirements.

The difference between the percentages of implementers in establishments where equal pay has been introduced and those in establishments where it has not is significant. An argument frequently used against equal pay is that women are unable by law to work the same hours as men and that there are other legal restrictions which makes them less valuable as employees even though they are doing the same or similar work. It is therefore a matter for speculation whether the managements who have not introduced equal pay have not done so because they are on average more likely to be opposed to equality or whether equal pay is more likely to be introduced in establishments where the legal restrictions are not felt to be an impediment.

The percentages of implementers in the sample groups who *think the laws regulating women's work cause difficulties* are as follows:—

		%
All implementers		12.2
Sex	Men	12.4
	Women	(11.1)
Age	39 and under	24.2
	40 – 54	10.0
	55 and over	2.8
Terminal education age	15 and under	9.1
	16 – 18	12.1
	19 and over	20.8
Attitude to E.P.	For	9.1
	NOT for	26.3
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	9.7
	Any two	12.3
	Any one	14.0
	None	(18.2)
Total number of employees	249 or less	4.8
	250 – 499	19.9
	500 or more	25.3
Number of women	99 or less	8.3
	100 – 249	10.3
	250 or more	37.1
Percentage of women	9% or less	7.3
	10 – 24%	8.1
	25 – 49%	26.3
	50% and over	10.7
E.P. introduced	Yes	4.9
	No	17.7
	None doing same work	10.2
Industry group	Food etc. manufacture	23.0
	Engineering	19.8
	Textiles etc.	15.5
	Transport and commun:	(–)
	Commerce etc.	(–)
	Distribution	(3.7)
Broad region	Central	14.5
	Northern	8.5
	Southern	19.1

The differences between industrial groups are very marked: if all the manufacturing industries are combined 18.3% of implementers find legal difficulties, compared with 1.0% in non-manufacturing industries. Putting it another way, 97.0% of those implementers who find difficulties come from manufacturing industries. Most of the existing legislation regulating women's employment is contained in the Factories Act 1961 and regulations made under it, which apply only to manufacturing establishments. (According to the Annual Census of Employment, at June 1972, 27.1% of all women employees were found in the manufacturing industries). A major part of the trade union opposition to relaxation of the legal restrictions on women's employment comes from unions representing women manual workers in manufacturing industries. This then, is likely to be the field in which conflicts of interests will most often arise.

So far we have compared the answers of implementers from establishments of different types. Comparisons between implementers with different personal characteristics is also revealing.

There is little difference between the views of men and women. This is perhaps surprising, but it is possible that women in managerial positions have themselves experienced disadvantages through the operation of protective legislation before they reached managerial status.

Of particular interest is the steady upward trend in the percentages from non-discriminators to pro-discriminators. We have shown elsewhere that the percentage of non-discriminators is almost the same among implementers in manufacturing and non-manufacturing industries, so it seems reasonable to conclude that attitudes to the effects of protective legislation are coloured by an individual's personal attitude to equality as well as by experience in the establishment in which he or she works.

There are very few mentions of individual difficulties. Restrictions on overtime are named by 2.5%, on night work by 1.4% and on weekend work by 1.1%.

Only 1.8% say they would actually like the laws to be changed.

Hours of work of men and women full-timers

Implementers were asked, in respect of each group of workers in which full-time workers were employed at the time of interview, what were the basic hours for men and for women full-timers.

The groups here are confined to those which came under the implementer's own jurisdiction. Owing to the wide diversity of organisations covered, sometimes the implementer interviewed was responsible for only part of the establishment and sometimes for all. It would have been unreasonable to ask questions about groups outside their knowledge and it is therefore possible that the information in this section does not fully cover all groups in all establishments. Nevertheless, the findings are so positive that it seems likely that any conclusions drawn will be valid, qualitatively if not always quantitatively.

Groups have been classified according to the categories used in the New Earnings Survey in 1968 and in 1970-2. Sometimes more than one group in an establishment came into the same category. These have been counted separately in the tables.

The following tables summarise the position over all non-manual and all manual categories. *The percentages in each table are all based on all categories (non-manual and manual respectively) in which full-timers are employed.* The vertical total column in each shows the percentages of all categories in which women have the stated basic hours, while the horizontal total line shows the percentage of all categories in which men have the stated basic hours.

		Basic hours of men full-timers						
	Total %	35 or less %	36–37 %	38–40 %	41–45 %	46 & over %	No. men emp'd %	Not stated %
NON-MANUAL								
(base: weighted 1811, unweighted 865)								
Basic hours of women full-timers								
35 or less	5.6	4.0	–	.2	–	–	1.4	–
36 – 37	13.4	–	11.8	.2	.2	–	1.2	–
38 – 40	29.4	–	–	22.8	.1	.1	6.4	–
41 – 45	1.4	–	–	–	1.3	–	.1	–
46 & over	1.2	–	–	–	–	1.1	.1	–
No women employed	46.0	2.8	8.0	29.8	1.9	3.3	–	.2
Not stated	3.0	.1	.1	1.8	–	–	.2	.8
Total	100.0	6.9	19.9	54.8	3.5	4.5	9.4	1.0
MANUAL								
(base: weighted 1841, unweighted 865)								
Basic hours of women full-timers								
35 or less	2.7	.2	.1	.9	–	–	1.5	–
36 – 37	1.7	–	.2	.8	–	–	.7	–
38 – 40	35.7	–	–	28.0	.1	.7	6.4	.5
41 – 45	1.9	–	–	–	1.0	–	.9	–
46 & over	.1	–	–	–	.1	–	–	–
No women employed	56.1	.5	.6	51.0	2.0	1.5	–	.5
Not stated	1.8	.1	–	1.0	–	–	.7	–
Total	100.0	.8	.9	81.7	3.2	2.2	10.2	1.0

The most striking feature of the table is the high proportion where no women are employed. Where both men and women are employed in a category the overwhelming majority have the same basic hours. If we take into account only those categories in which both men and women full-timers are employed, in 91.9% of non-manual and in 87.1% of manual categories the basic hours are the same.

If we omit for men and for women respectively the categories in which none are employed, we obtain the following comparison of basic hours.

	Non-manual		Manual	
	Women %	Men %	Women %	Men %
Basic hours				
30 or less	1.2	1.2	2.9	.2
31 – 35	9.2	6.5	3.2	.7
36 – 40	79.2	82.5	85.3	92.0
41 – 45	2.7	3.8	4.3	3.5
46 & over	2.1	4.9	.2	2.5
Not stated	5.5	1.1	4.1	1.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

None of the individual categories differ significantly from the overall position in respect of hours worked. It would therefore be superfluous to produce individual tables. There are considerable differences in the percentages in which no women and no men full-timers are employed but we have dealt elsewhere in some detail with categories in which women are never employed and the reasons for this. We show there that working hours are comparatively unimportant as a reason.

It is apparent that, where men and women are employed on the same or broadly similar work, their basic full-time hours are the same in the vast majority of cases. The evidence over many years that the average actual hours worked by men full-timers considerably exceed those worked by women must therefore be a consequence of the different occupational composition and, possibly, of variations in the extent to which overtime is worked.

Overtime

Overtime is regarded by many men as a useful means of supplementing their incomes and the opportunity to work overtime is often one of the attractions of a job. The consequent loss of leisure time is not always felt to be a great hardship. Women with domestic responsibilities, on the other hand, are more likely to feel that the curtailment of the time available for domestic tasks imposes a considerable strain on them. The official policy of most trade unions is that overtime should be voluntary but unwillingness to work overtime is unfavourably regarded by many managements. Bans on overtime are sanctions often applied by trade unions, frequently with far-reaching effects.

Whether desirable or not, systematic overtime plays an important part in the running of many establishments. Therefore, the restrictions on women's working hours or their unwillingness to work overtime may cause management to regard them as less satisfactory employees. We therefore asked, in respect of each category in which full-timers are employed, whether there are opportunities for any employees to work paid overtime on a regular basis and, where men and women are employed, whether both men and women work paid overtime on a regular basis ("regular" was defined as at least some overtime in at least three weeks out of four).

The following table shows the answers in respect of each category. (All percentages are based on the total number of each category.)

	Over-time avail-able	Sex employed			Where both employed Overtime worked by:		
		Men only	*Women only*	*Both*	*Men* only*	*Women* only*	*Both**
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Non-manual							
All (1)	30.6	46.1	9.4	44.5	1.4	.3	10.5
Managers	16.1	67.5	–	32.5	1.0	.3	3.8
Supervisors	29.7	47.2	4.2	48.6	1.6	.3	15.9
Engineers, scientists, technologists	28.8	76.1	.1	23.3	–	–	5.5
Technicians	49.9	65.9	9.2	24.9	.5	.5	5.1
Office staff	31.5	7.3	16.1	76.6	1.4	.2	20.3
Sales staff	38.9	55.6	7.9	36.5	5.3	–	7.9
Manual							
All (1)	64.1	56.2	10.2	33.6	4.7	.2	16.2
Supervisors & foremen	75.9	56.4	1.5	42.1	1.8	1.1	26.3
Catering, domestic	27.5	10.2	55.8	34.0	1.5	.4	13.8
Skilled	78.1	81.0	.3	18.7	2.5	–	8.4
Apprentices etc.	56.8	75.7	4.6	19.7	.6	–	13.5
Semi-skilled	76.8	48.0	4.4	47.6	9.7	–	21.4
Unskilled	71.1	58.6	1.6	39.8	10.7	–	18.4
Transport workers	82.0	94.4	2.2	3.4	–	–	3.4

(1) These include some categories too few in number to be shown separately.

* i.e. by any, not necessarily by all.

Regular paid overtime is far more a feature of manual occupations than of non-manual. On the other hand more or less voluntary unpaid overtime is frequently worked as and when needed by many people in non-manual occupations, such as managers, scientists etc. (We did not investigate voluntary unpaid overtime. Often no records of this are kept and information might therefore not be reliable.)

The general conclusion that can be drawn is that, where both sexes are employed, it is much more usual for both sexes to work regular overtime than for men only to do so. However, overtime working is almost never confined to women.

It is noteworthy that among manual categories the percentage where overtime is available is very much lower in the case of catering and domestic workers, in over half of which women only are employed. This may, however, be a consequence of the high percentage of establishments which employ part-timers in this category. Roughly two-thirds do so, many in addition to full-timers.

The number of instances in which overtime is worked by one sex but not by the other are too few for analysis in detail of the reasons. In 52.2% of all instances where women do not work overtime it is said to be because they do not wish to do so and in 32.7% because there is no need.

The limitation of leisure hours caused by overtime working will be more severe if the overtime is superimposed on an already long basic working week. We have shown that the great majority of working weeks consist of 36 – 40 hours, so that the numbers which fall outside this range are too few for reliable analysis. It can be said however, that all the manual and nearly all the non-manual categories in which regular overtime is worked have a basic week of 36 or more hours. This is true for both men and women. It seems, therefore, that regular overtime may result in considerable strain on women with domestic responsibilities.

Shift working

Restriction on shift working by women is often quoted as a factor which militates against their progress towards equality. Women in the trade union movement are sharply divided on this issue. At one extreme it is argued that women should be protected by legislation whether they desire it or not, while at the other it is claimed that such restrictions constitute an interference with the liberty of the individual and should be entirely abolished.

The present survey confined itself to an investigation into the extent to which shifts are worked in groups of workers in which both men and women full-timers are employed. Implementers were asked whether any employees work shifts and if so, whether both men and women work shifts.

The percentages of establishments in each industrial group in which *any of these groups of workers at all work shifts* are as follows:

	%
All industries	41.1
Food, etc. manufacture	57.4
Engineering etc.	30.7
Textiles, etc.	53.2
Transport & communication	22.7
Commerce etc.	51.6
Distribution	22.2

Therefore, so far as groups including both men and women are concerned, shift working occurs at all in less than half the industries.

The following figures show that shift working occurs in only a minority of categories where men and women full-timers are employed.

The percentages are based on the total numbers of each category in which full-timers of either sex are employed (including those in establishments where there is not shift working).

	Both sexes employed		Shifts worked by:		
	Total	Shifts worked	Men only	Women only	Both
	%	%	%	%	%
All non-manual	44.5	4.8	1.4	.8	2.6
Managers	32.5	1.5	1.2	–	.3
Supervisors	48.6	5.2	1.4	–	3.5
Engineers, scientists	23.3	.6	.6	–	–
Technicians	24.9	2.2	.6	–	1.6
Office staff	76.6	6.1	1.1	.5	4.5
Sales staff	36.5	.5	–	–	.5
Other non-manual	31.6	16.3	4.3	5.8*	6.2
	* These are all medical or similar staff				
All manual	33.6	15.4	8.1	1.2	6.1
Supervisors	42.1	13.6	7.0	–	6.6
Catering, domestic	34.0	17.7	4.1	4.5	9.1
Skilled manual	18.7	10.5	6.0	1.0	3.5
Apprentices etc.	19.7	3.5	–	–	3.5
Semi-skilled	47.6	25.0	16.5	–	8.5
Unskilled	39.8	22.4	14.5	2.3	5.6
Transport workers	3.4	2.2	–	–	2.2
Other manual	42.7	6.1	–	–	6.1

As in the case of overtime working, these figures show merely whether any individuals work shifts: for example, if one man in a group works shifts he carries as much weight in the table as if the whole group of men were working shifts. Conclusions can therefore be of only a general character.

Shift working, like overtime, is much more a feature of manual occupations than of non-manual. Even among manual categories, however, the percentage where shifts are worked does not amount to much more than half those where both sexes are employed in any category. In most categories men are more likely than women to work shifts but an appreciable proportion of some categories where shifts are worked include both men and women shift workers.

The numbers of instances where one sex but not the other work shifts are too small to justify analysis. It can be said that the reasons in general indicate that either the work done by all individuals in the group is not precisely the same, with the result that only some are required to work shifts, or that it is "not necessary" for all to work shifts. Legal restrictions are not mentioned as such, but it should be remembered that the investigation was confined to groups where both men and women full-timers are employed. It is possible that legal restrictions might have some influence on the groups in which employers decide to employ women.

Chapter XIV Part-time workers

Introduction

We have said that at the sampling stage detailed information was obtained about the numbers and categories of full-time and part-time workers employed. This was not re-recorded at the interviewing stage, but a number of questions were asked of formulators and implementers about the employment of part-timers. There are some small differences between the sampling stage figures and those obtained at interviews. These arise because in some establishments there had been changes in the work force during the two or three months which elapsed between sampling and interviewing and also because in a few establishments interviews were not obtained with both formulator and implementer. The interpretation of "part-time" was left to the establishment.

The figures in the first part of this section are derived from sampling-stage information, the remainder from that obtained at interviews.

We have explained that where the same individual carried out the functions of both formulator and implementer it was not possible to ask the whole of the two lengthy questionnaires. Among questions which had to be omitted were some dealing with details of part-time workers. This means that the answers to some of the subsidiary questions relating to part-timers can be reported on in general terms only, because those who answered cannot necessarily be regarded as being representative of the sample of establishments. However, the main questions dealing with the extent to which any part-timers are eligible for facilities or fringe benefits were addressed to all implementers and these are dealt with in detail.

Employment of part-time workers at time of sampling.

We deal later with the extent to which part-timers are employed at all in all types of establishment. Here we give details of the *numbers* of part-timers employed at establishments of different sizes.

The following table shows the numbers of women and men part-timers employed at establishments.

(This and other tables in this part are based on the 223 establishments where interviews were obtained).

		Total number of employees		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250 to 499*	*500 or more*
All establishments WEIGHTED	(560)	(322)	(136)	(102)
(unweighted figures)	(223) %	(65) %	(75) %	(83) %
Number of women part-timers				
None	21.6	28.9	14.7	7.8
1 – 9	25.4	26.4	30.8	14.7
10 – 19	15.5	18.3	6.6	18.6
20 – 49	21.2	16.8	22.8	33.3
50 – 99	8.9	5.0	18.4	8.8
100 or more	7.4	4.7	6.6	16.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

		Total number of employees		
	Total	249 or less	250 to 499	500 or more
All establishments WEIGHTED	(560)	(322)	(136)	(102)
(unweighted figures)	(223)	(65)	(75)	(83)
	%	%	%	%
Number of men part-timers				
None	59.6	55.6	69.1	59.8
1 – 9	36.1	42.2	25.0	31.4
10 or more	4.3	2.2	5.9	8.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

While part-time employment is not confined exclusively to women, the extent is very much less in the case of men.

The following summarises the extent to which establishments employ part-timers.

(unweighted base)	(223)
Establishments which employ:	%
Male part-timers only	.4
Female only	38.4
Both	40.0
Neither	21.2
	100.0

The extent to which women part-timers are employed increases sharply with increasing total employees. The same is not true for men part-timers.

The extent to which women part-timers are employed increases even more sharply with increasing number of women employed.

		Total number of women		
	Total	99 or less	100 to 249	250 or more
All establishments WEIGHTED	(560)	(312)	(173)	(75)
(unweighted figures)	(223)	(104)	(71)	(48)
Number of women part-timers	%	%	%	%
None	21.6	28.5	17.3	2.7
1 – 9	25.4	39.7	7.5	6.7
10 – 29	26.0	22.1	38.2	14.6
30 – 49	10.7	8.7	5.2	32.0
50 or over	16.3	1.0	31.8	44.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

It is only to be expected that establishments which employ large numbers of women will employ more part-timers than will smaller establishments. What is noteworthy is the findng that the percentage who employ any at all is so much greater.

On the following page we show the categories of work in which men and women part-timers are employed.

Percentages of all establishments which employ any part-timers in each category.

			Total number of employees		
		Total	*249 or less*	*250 – 499*	*500 or more*
Non-manual		%	%	%	%
Managerial	Men	–	–	–	–
	Women	.5	.9	–	–
Supervisors	Men	–	–	–	–
	Women	2.9	4.3	–	2.0
Scientists, technologists	Men	–	–	–	–
	Women	3.5	–	2.2	4.9
Office staff	Men	8.6	9.3	5.1	10.9
	Women *	43.4	40.7	48.5	55.9
Sales staff	Men *	1.4	.9	2.2	2.0
	Women *	9.5	9.3	13.2	4.9
Other non-manual	Men *	3.8	1.2	5.9	8.8
	Women *	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9
Manual					
Supervisors, foremen	Men	.2	–	.7	–
	Women	5.7	3.7	10.3	5.9
Sales (manual)	Men *	–	–	–	–
	Women	1.8	.9	2.2	3.9
Catering, domestic, etc.	Men *	17.9	20.5	11.7	17.6
	Women *	56.6	56.8	48.5	66.7
Skilled manual, craftsmen	Men	8.8	10.6	5.9	6.9
	Women	6.1	3.1	13.2	5.9
Skilled manual apprentices	Men *	.2	–	.7	–
	Women	1.4	1.9	–	3.0
Semi skilled manual	Men	4.6	3.4	5.9	6.9
	Women *	13.9	9.6	22.8	15.7
Unskilled manual	Men *	22.9	25.8	18.4	19.6
	Women *	19.1	14.6	22.1	29.4
Others unclassifiable	Men *	5.2	2.8	8.8	7.9
	Women *	7.0	6.2	7.3	8.8

(The lines marked * each include a very few establishments which employ part-time boys or girls).

These figures confirm evidence from other sources that the jobs done by male and female part-timers compare unfavourably in status with those done by full-timers of the same sex. The numbers are not large enough for definite conclusions, but there are indications that women part-timers are more likely than men part-timers to be employed in supervisory jobs.

Eligibility of part-timers for facilities

Questions relating to the eligibility of part-timers for certain facilities were addressed to all implementers.

Subsidiary questions to identify which categories of part-timers are eligible were not asked where the same person combined the functions of formulator and implementer.

The summary below shows the answers to the main questions.

a) *The percentage of all establishments in which implementers were interviewed which employed any part-timers at the time of interview.*

u) *Unweighted figures on which columns (b) - (f) are based (i.e. establishments employing part-timers).*

b) Percentage which allow *flexibility of hours to any part-timers.*

c) Percentage in which *any part-timers are eligible for promotion.*

d) Percentage in which *any part-timers are eligible for the firm's pensions scheme.*

e) Percentage in which *any part-timers are eligible for sick pay.*

f) Percentage in which *any part-timers are given facilities for training.*

		(a) %	(u) No.	(b) %	(c) %	(d) %	(e) %	(f) %
Total		87.9	(196)	58.2	17.3	13.9	50.0	27.5
Attitude to E.P.	For	86.0	(146)	57.2	16.0	12.5	51.0	29.6
	Others	96.7	(50	65.1	21.3	12.4	43.8	18.0
Discrimination index	For: all three	77.3	(53)	60.3	15.4	20.6	69.9	41.9
	Any two	92.1	(78)	62.0	16.6	11.8	51.9	23.5
	Any one	78.7	(53)	57.0	13.1	15.9	50.5	28.0
	None	(100.0)	(12)	(70.0)	(–)	(9.0)	(9.0)	(9.0)
Total number of employees	249 or less	84.3	(54)	60.6	15.2	6.3	45.0	33.1
	250 – 499	91.2	(68)	52.2	17.7	23.3	51.4	16.1
	500 or more	93.8	(74)	59.3	23.1	23.1	62.6	26.4
Number of women	99 or less	86.8	(81)	62.5	15.1	9.8	49.2	27.7
	100 – 249	85.2	(62)	56.5	16.7	13.3	40.5	27.9
	250 or more	97.2	(45)	45.7	27.1	30.0	72.8	25.7
Percentage of women	9% or less	80.6	(33)	52.9	1.1	4.6	37.9	19.5
	10 – 24%	85.8	(52)	72.5	15.5	14.5	46.4	30.9
	25 – 49%	91.1	(47)	75.1	20.7	28.6	71.9	14.6
	50% or more	90.6	(64)	45.5	23.8	10.9	47.0	35.1
E.P. introduced	Yes	86.7	(49)	59.5	19.0	17.2	49.1	17.2
	No	93.7	(110)	62.9	16.9	12.9	47.7	34.5
	None doing same work	89.8	(37)	44.3	13.9	10.1	54.4	25.3
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	96.7	(29)	(50.8)	(18.6)	(22.0)	(86.4)	(52.5)
	Engineering	89.8	(63)	71.9	18.3	18.4	46.5	12.3
	Textiles, etc.	84.8	(60)	65.9	18.6	5.2	21.7	33.4
	Transport & communication	(68.0)	(13)	(58.8)	(–)	(33.3)	(72.5)	(31.4)
	Commerce etc.	(96.0)	(12)	(53.2)	(25.8)	(8.1)	(51.6)	(22.6)
	Distribution	(100.0)	(19)	(22.2)	(20.4)	(7.4)	(70.4)	(18.5)
Broad region	Central	91.3	(62)	68.7	20.6	3.6	35.3	25.8
	Northern	86.0	(76)	50.2	12.5	12.5	46.3	30.7
	Southern	88.7	(58)	65.7	25.5	30.4	77.5	21.6

Percentages in brackets should be treated with caution.

The principal object of this summary is to show the position of part-timers as an entity in establishments where they are employed. In some part at least the extent to which part-timers are allowed to participate in facilities, such as pensions schemes for example, must depend on the extent to which there are such facilities for any workers in the establishments which they are employed. Looking at the situation solely from the viewpoint of the part-timer, however, it is irrelevant whether any other workers receive sick pay if the part-timer does not.

a) *Extent to which part-timers are employed*

In Great Britain the development of part-time work has been regarded by most organisations as a forward step for women, because it enables them to combine more easily the two roles of worker and housewife. This attitude is not held in every country. In some Common Market countries the introduction of part-time work is regarded as a retrograde step which prevents women from fully exercising their right to work. The demands of some women's organisations in these countries are for the provision of facilities (such as those for child care) which will enable women to work full-time and so be regarded as full-status members of the work force.

Whatever the philosophical arguments may be, there is no doubt that in Great Britain there is a considerable demand for part-time work on the part of married women. There is also criticism of the comparatively low status of much of the part-time work which is available.

Part-timers were employed *at the time of interview* by 87.9% of establishments. Differences between the sample groups are not very great, except in the case of the industrial groups and these are not statistically significant because of the small numbers involved. It is interesting that in establishments where the implementer is in favour of equal pay, in those where he is a non-discriminator and in those where equal pay has been introduced the percentage which employ part-timers is below the average.

(b) *Flexibility of hours*

58.2% of establishments which employ part-timers permit flexibility in the hours worked.

The percentage is significantly lower in establishments employing 50% or more of women and almost so in establishments employing 250 or more women. Presumably it is more difficult to allow flexibility where large numbers are involved or where a large percentage of the work-force might be affected, because the result could be that jobs were inadequately covered at those times which were unpopular with a lot of part-timers.

A probable explanation of the exceptionally low percentage where flexibility is allowed in the distribution industry is that part-timers are usually engaged to cover the busiest shopping times and would not be required at other times.

Implementers were asked elsewhere in the questionnaire whether flexible hours were permitted in general. Roughly one-third said they were. It seems, therefore, that part-timers are more likely than full-timers to be able to choose the hours they work.

c) *Eligibility for promotion*

Implementers were asked, in respect of each category in which both full-timers and part-timers are employed, whether part-timers in that category are eligible for promotion to the same level as full-timers, to a lower level, or are they not eligible at all.

The figures given in column (c) of the preceding table are a summary of the answers given in respect of all categories and show, for establishments which employ part-timers, whether any part-timers at all, at any level, are eligible for promotion. Thus they portray the situation in the most favourable light from the point of view of part-timers. Even so, in only 13.7% of establishments which employ part-timers is there any chance for any of them to be promoted. This reinforces the criticisms which have been made of the comparatively low status of part-time work.

There are two groups where the promotion position is significantly worse than in others. In establishments with less than 10% of women employees only 1.1% allow promotion for part-timers and in the transport and communications group none do so.

The highest percentage which allow promotion for part-timers are found in: establishments with 500 or more employees (23.1%); those with 250 or more women employees (27.1%); those with 50% or more women (23.8%); the commerce group (25.8%); the Southern region (25.5%). In none of these, it should be noted, does the proportion amount to as many as 3 out of 10.

The numbers in individual categories where both part-timers and full-timers are employed are too small for analysis. It can only be said that promotional opportunities are almost entirely confined to office staff and catering and domestic workers. Promotion, but to a lower level than full-time workers, is hardly mentioned at all, but the proviso is sometimes made that part-timers must become full-timers on promotion.

(d) *Eligibility for the firm's pensions scheme*

The table shows that in 13.9% of establishments which employ them, some part-timers at least are eligible for the firm's pension scheme. The subsidiary questions asking which categories are eligible was not put to all implementers, so it is not possible to say with any exactitude in what proportion of establishments all part-timers are eligible. The rough indications are that this is the case in about half the establishments which admit part-timers to their schemes.

The extent of eligibility of part-timers does not follow the same pattern as does the existence of pensions schemes as a whole. The most marked differences in both cases are between industries but there is very little correlation between the two. In other words, in industries where higher percentages have pensions schemes, part-time are not necessarily more likely to be eligible. Part-timers are more likely to be eligible for pensions schemes in larger establishments, in those with 250 or more women employees and in those with between 25 and 49% of women employees. Among the indust rial groups, although the percentage where part-timers are eligible in the transport group greatly exceeds those in most other groups the small number of establishments in this group prevents the difference from being statistically significant.

The difference between the Central and Southern regions, however, is significant.

The figures should not be used as a basis for national estimates because the sample of establishments excluded a number of industries where pension entitlements differ from those in the selected industries.

The Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey of 1970 gives the following figures for the percentages of employees covered by occupational pension schemes (figures marked * have been derived from the others, which are given in Table III).

	Total %	*Males* %	*Females* %
Full-time	49.8 *	55.3	36.0
Part-time	5.6 *	14.0 *	4.5 *
All	44.3 *	54.4	26.4

The relatively inferior position of women, whether part-time or full-time workers, is apparent from these figures. They are not directly comparable with those from the present survey because the New Earnings Survey relates to individuals and the present survey to establishments.

The number of establishments where any part-timers are eligible for pensions schemes is too small for firm conclusions about the number and kinds of part-timers who are eligible. All that can be said is that in only about half the establishments where *any* part-timers are eligible is the benefit extended to *all* part-timers.

(e) *Eligibility for sick pay*

The percentage of establishments where part-timers are eligible for sick pay is higher than the percentages where they are eligible for promotion, pension schemes or training. This is true in every one of the groups in the sample.

Eligibility for sick leave, as for pensions schemes, depends on the extent to which sick pay is available for any employees. We show elsewhere that a little over 80% of the establishments in the sample provide sick pay for some at least of their employees. The percentages in which part-timers are eligible do not follow the same pattern as the percentages in which sick pay is provided for any employees. Part-timers are more likely to be eligible in establishments where the implementer of policy is a non-discriminator, where there are 500 or more employees, where there are 250 or more women employees, where there are between 25 and 49% of women, in food etc. manufacturing and in the Southern region. They are least likely to be eligible in the textiles etc. industrial group. This industrial group is the one which includes the lowest percentage of establishments which provide sick pay for any employees and the lowest percentage in which part-timers are eligible for pensions schemes.

The Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey 1970 gives the following figures for the percentages of employees covered by sick pay schemes.

	Total %	*Males* %	*Females* %
Full-time	72.8 *	72.8	72.7
Part-time	52.5 *	40.7 *	54.0 *
All	70.3 *	72.1	67.0

* Derived from figures given in Table III. These figures relate to individuals, not, as in the present survey, to establishments.

From the findings of the present survey, it can only be stated in general terms that by no means all part-timers are eligible for sick pay in establishments where any are eligible. On the basis of the admittedly incomplete figures which are derived from the answers given by those implementers who were asked the question it appears that in less than half these establishments are all part-timers eligible.

(f) Facilities for training

The exact wording of the question was:

"Are any part-timers given facilities to obtain further education or training, either by the firm or an outside organisation?"

Only 27.5% of establishments which employ part-timers give any of them training facilities. Once again the proportion of establishments which give any part-timers training facilities must depend on the extent to which any workers at all are given facilities. We show elsewhere that roughly eight out of ten establishments provide training for at least some employees. The percentages providing the training for part-timers do not follow the same pattern as the percentages who provide training for any. The former do not show consistent increases or decreases with increasing size of firm, total number of women and percentage of women.

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the training of part-timers is the wide variation between industries. The figures of 12.3% for the engineering industry is lower than in any other industrial group. For example, the difference between this figure and those for textiles etc. (33.4%) and food etc. manufacturing (52.5%) is significant in spite of the small number of establishments in the last named group.

It can be said in general terms only that in less than one half of the establishments which offer training facilities to part-timers are these facilities available to all part-timers. Where training facilities for part-timers exist they are usually the same as those for full-timers.

How long part-timers have been employed

Among the questions which were addressed only to implementers who did not combine this function with that of formulator were two which asked how long men and women part-timers have been employed at the establishment.

Because of the small (and possibly non-representative) number who were asked this question it would be unwise to regard the figures quoted here as giving a quantitative estimate. The length of time for which part-timers have been employed, both for men and women, shows two sharp peaks. 28.4% of those answering the question in respect of men say men part-timers had been employed for less than 5 years and 39.7% for 20 years or more. The corresponding figures for women part-timers are 24.6% and 44.4%. It appears legitimate to draw the general conclusion that, for a majority of establishments, part-time work has either existed for a considerable time or has been introduced very recently.

The numbers are too small for very firm conclusions, but there are indications of a tendency to introduce men and women part-timers at roughly the same time. 69.4% of implementers from establishments which employ both men and women part-timers give answers which indicate that this is the case. 21.9% have employed both men and women for less than 5 years, 32.8% for 20 years or more.

Future plans for employing part-timers

All implementers, whether or not part-timers were employed at the time of the survey, were asked:

"Has the question of employing any (more) part-timers ever been considered?"

The percentages who have considered employing (more) part-timers are as follows:—

		%
All implementers		68.7
Attitude to E.P.	For	69.7
	Others	65.2
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	67.6
	Any two	66.5
	Any one	75.0
	None	(60.6)
Total number of employees	249 or less	73.0
	250 – 499	63.2
	500 and over	61.5
Number of women	99 or less	67.5
	100 – 249	70.3
	250 or more	68.1
Percentage of women	9% or less	60.7
	10 – 24%	57.3
	25 – 49%	70.8
	50% or more	77.4
E.P. introduced	Yes	72.9
	No	69.0
	None doing same work	64.4
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	(65.6)
	Engineering	57.1
	Textiles etc.	67.0
	Transport & communication	(68.0)
	Commerce etc.	(93.8)
	Distribution	(75.9)
Broad region	Central	43.5
	Northern	80.3
	Southern	68.7
Part-timers employed now	Yes	72.8
	No	38.8

Thus a little more than two-thirds of establishments have considered the question of taking on (more) part-timers. Subsidiary questions were asked only of those implementers who did not combine this function with that of formulator, so the numbers answering are comparatively small and possibly not representative. Even so, it is worth noting that 21.7% of those who answered the question, "Have you definitely decided to employ (more) part-timers or not?", (7.8% of all implementers) have definitely decided not to employ (more) part-timers, while 40.4% of those answering (14.5% of all) have decided to do so.

The most striking difference between groups is that between establishments who are and who are not already employing part-timers. The former are far more likely to have considered taking on more part-timers than the latter are to have considered starting to do so. Even taking into account the finding that 8.9% of the former, compared with none of the latter, have decided not to engage (more) part-timers, it is still apparent that increases in the extent to which part-timers are employed are more likely to come from firms which already employ some.

Regional differences are quite marked. However, if the percentages of establishments which have definitely decided not to engage more part-timers are taken into account (.7% in the Central region, 13.7% in the Northern and .9% in the Southern) the differences are reduced.

Differences between industrial groups are also marked. Generally speaking, manufacturing industries are less likely than the others to have considered employing (more) part-timers (the difference between manufacturing industries taken as a whole and the rest is statistically significant, though not all the individual differences are so).

As we have said, the number who answered the subsidiary questions are too small for detailed analysis. Generally speaking, the categories for which part-timers are most likely to be considered are office workers, catering and domestic workers, semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers. There are very few mentions of more senior or skilled workers.

Those who answered the relevant question are almost equally divided between those who have considered women part-timers only and those who have considered both men and women. There was only 1 (unweighted figure) establishment where men part-timers only have been considered. In a sense this may be regarded as a form of discrimination against men because there are undoubtedly some men who for family or other reasons would welcome the opportunity of part-time employment.

The rate of national insurance contributions is said to have influenced the decision not to employ part-timers in roughly one-third of instances (this figure is based on 15 establishments only, so it must be regarded as purely an indication).

In establishments where the question of employing (more) part-timers has not been considered, implementers were asked whether they personally would be in favour if the question was raised. Of those who answered the question, 26.2% are in favour, 44.3% are against, and 29.5% are undecided.

Advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time workers

Implementers were asked a number of detailed questions about the extent to which part-timers are employed in the establishment. Formulators were asked only for their views on the advantages and disadvantages of employing part-time workers.

Full details are given in the tables at the end of this section. The following are some of the more interesting findings.

18.3% say there are no advantages, compared with 14.9% who say there are no disadvantages. This difference is not significant and there is no uniformity of responses in that those groups which include a higher than average percentage saying there are no advantages do not necessarily include a lower than average percentage saying there are no disadvantages. There is one interesting exception to this: formulators from establishments where equal pay has been introduced are more likely to say there are no advantages and less likely to say there are no disadvantages than are formulators from establishments without equal pay.

Formulators from establishments with 250 or more women employees are less likely to say there are no advantages but are also less likely to say there are no disadvantages. It can possibly be assumed that they speak from greater knowledge of employing part-timers and are therefore more aware of both advantages and disadvantages.

The average number of disadvantages mentioned exceeds the number of advantages (1.5 compared with 1.2). It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that there is still a considerable amount of resistance to the idea of employing part-timers.

Full details are given in the tables which follow. The following points appear worthy of comment.

The three leading advantages are given as: can have them only when you need them (27.5%); useful if you can't get full-timers (23.2%); useful if job doesn't require full-time staff (18.8%). The first of these pays little regard to the needs or desires of the part-time workers themselves; the second implies that part-timers are only a second best and the third makes their employment conditional on the nature of the job. Comparatively few formulators mention attributes of part-timers (12.2% conscientiousness; 5.5% particular skills and 5.0% better attendance).

The leading disadvantages are given as: lack of continuity (28.2%); too costly (18.3%); job requires full-time cover (17.2%); administrative difficulties (12.9%); cost of N.I. stamps (12.2%). These all relate to the requirements of the employer. Criticism of part-timers themselves are less frequently mentioned: 10.1% mention lack of involvement, 10.1% absenteeism, 5.2% lower standard of work.

The percentage of formulators in the commerce group who say there are no advantages in employing part-timers (60.9%) is significantly higher than in any other industrial group and the percentage in the distribution group giving this answer (1.9%) is significantly lower than in almost all other groups. These are not paralleled by correspondingly lower and higher percentages saying there are no disadvantages.

It is useful to compare the answers given by formulators who have had experience of employing part-timers with the answers of those who have not. The following is a comparison of the two.

	Formulators from establishments which	
	Employ part-timers	*Do NOT employ*
(Unweighted bases)	(189)	(23)
	%	%
Advantages		
Useful to be able to have them only when you need them	27.6	(26.7)
Useful if you can't get full-timers	25.0	(14.0)
Useful if job doesn't require full-timers	18.6	19.8
Part-timers work harder, more conscientious	11.6	(15.1)
Cheaper, keeps costs down	10.5	(11.5)
Provide cover to ensure jobs get done	8.1	(3.5)
Able to work hours which suit firm	6.1	(2.3)
Useful if people with particular skill needed	3.5	(16.3)
Better attendance, punctuality	3.3	(14.0)
More cover in case of absences	2.4	(7.0)
Other answers	7.6	(–)
None	19.5	(9.3)
No opinion, not answered	4.2	(4.2)

	Formulators from establishments which	
	Employ part-timers	*Do NOT employ*
(Unweighted bases)	(189)	(23)
Disadvantages		%
Lack of continuity	27.9	(30.2)
Too costly	19.1	(14.0)
It's a full-time job, needs full-time cover	18.2	(11.6)
Organisational difficulties	14.9	(1.2)
Cost of insurance stamps	14.5	(–)
Lack of interest, involvement, loyalty	13.8	(4.7)
Unreliable because of absenteeism	10.3	(9.3)
Disrupt full-time workers	7.5	(–)
Don't work so hard	5.5	(3.5)
Spend more time training them	5.5	(–)
Cause bad relations, resentment	4.4	(1.2)
Cause problems of supervision	4.4	(–)
Lack of space, need more space	.9	(14.0)
High turnover	2.9	(1.2)
Communication difficulties	2.6	(–)
Other answers	12.6	(12.1)
None	16.2	(4.5)
No opinion, not answered	5.2	(7.6)

On the evidence of these figures, formulators with experience of employing part-timers have a lower opinion of their value as workers than do those without such experience. This is particularly apparent in the consistently higher percentage who make specific criticisms as well as in the higher percentage who say there are no advantages in employing part-timers. The impression is given that part-timers are frequently regarded as second-class workers, only to be employed if full-timers are not available. (A somewhat similar impression is given elsewhere on the value of women workers vis-a-vis men).

Advantages of employing part-time workers (by age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay and discrimination index)

		Age			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*		*Discrimination index: In favour of:*			
	Total	*39 & under*	*40–54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16–18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*NOT for*	*Three aspects*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131	142	211	143	46
Unweighted figures	*212 %	50 %	120 %	40 %	40 %	114 %	55 %	157 %	55 %	60 %	83 %	50 %	19 %
Advantages of employing part-time workers													
Useful to be able to have them only when you need them	27.5	18.5	29.3	34.1	23.1	24.5	41.4	28.4	23.3	15.5	23.2	43.4	(34.8)
Useful if can't get full-timers	23.2	25.8	23.1	20.7	9.8	29.9	25.0	18.3	38.3	35.2	19.0	12.6	(39.1)
Useful if job doesn't require full-time staff	18.8	20.2	17.1	23.2	16.8	20.9	13.8	18.3	21.0	12.7	27.5	14.7	(10.9)
Part-timers work harder, are more conscientious	12.2	29.0	6.0	22.0	9.8	10.8	16.4	12.3	12.0	16.2	12.8	2.1	(28.3)
Cheaper, keeps cost down	10.7	8.1	8.4	22.0	13.3	5.8	17.2	9.4	14.3	7.0	12.3	11.9	(10.9)
Provide better cover to make sure jobs get done	7.4	19.4	3.6	4.9	–	11.9	6.0	16.3	–	4.2	4.3	9.1	(26.1)
Able to work hours which suit firm	5.5	4.0	1.5	24.4	8.4	4.0	6.0	4.7	8.3	1.4	8.1	5.6	(6.5)
Useful if you need people with particular skills, experience	5.5	1.6	7.5	4.9	10.5	3.3	6.00	12.2	12.0	6.3	1.4	11.9	(4.3)
Better attendance, punctuality	5.0	10.5	.6	14.6	13.3	2.9	–	4.9	4.5	9.2	3.3	4.9	(–)
More cover in cases of absences	3.1	2.4	3.0	4.9	–	5.0	–	4.2	–	7.0	2.8	.7	(–)
Other answers	6.7	8.9	6.3	3.6	2.1	10.5	.9	7.6	2.2	2.1	13.3	2.8	(–)
None	18.3	16.1	21.9	7.3	26.6	17.3	11.2	21.9	6.9	21.1	22.7	14.7	(–)
No opinion, not answered	4.2	8.1	3.6	–	.7	4.3	7.8	3.2	7.6	1.4	5.2	3.5	(10.9)

Includes 2 formulators whose ages were not given and three whose terminal education ages were not given (unweighted figures).

Advantages of employing part-time workers (by total number of employees, number of women, percentage of women and whether equal pay introduced)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
	Total	*249 or less*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% or more*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Advantages of employing part-time workers														
Useful to be able to have them only when you need them	27.5	27.2	28.5	27.1	28.8	20.4	42.4	51.3	25.4	7.1	25.6	18.5	32.3	32.7
Useful if can't get full-timers	23.2	15.2	40.8	26.0	18.2	28.2	33.9	9.7	30.7	22.4	27.0	20.1	22.4	30.6
Useful if job does not require full-time staff	18.8	14.9	25.4	22.9	16.9	23.2	15.3	19.5	26.3	14.3	16.7	18.5	19.7	16.3
Part-timers work harder, are more conscientious	12.2	13.9	9.2	10.4	7.3	18.8	16.9	–	5.3	9.2	23.7	4.8	14.6	20.4
Cheaper, keeps cost down	10.7	11.1	8.5	12.5	10.9	9.9	11.9	7.1	14.9	10.2	10.7	5.8	14.6	10.2
Provide better cover to make sure jobs get done	7.4	7.9	7.7	5.2	5.0	12.2	5.1	.9	5.3	11.2	10.2	5.8	6.3	13.3
Able to work hours which suit firm	5.5	2.5	13.1	5.2	1.0	12.7	6.8	.9	2.6	8.2	8.4	2.1	9.8	1.0
Useful if you need people with particular skills, experience	5.5	6.0	3.8	7.3	3.0	9.9	5.1	.9	3.5	7.1	8.4	9.0	3.5	4.1
Better attendance, punctuality	5.0	6.0	4.6	2.1	4.3	6.6	3.4	–	–	1.0	12.1	.5	9.8	1.0
More cover in case of absence	3.1	3.8	3.1	1.0	4.3	2.2	–	2.7	3.5	6.1	1.9	3.2	2.0	6.1
Other answers	6.7	7.9	4.6	5.2	2.9	12.8	1.7	4.5	2.0	2.0	9.7	11.6	3.6	3.1
None	18.3	25.6	18.5	7.3	24.5	11.1	8.5	20.4	1.7	30.0	20.9	29.1	11.0	16.3
No opinion, not answered	4.2	4.4	3.8	4.2	5.0	3.9	1.7	2.7	12.1	5.1	.5	5.8	3.1	4.1

Advantages of employing part-time workers (by industry group and broad region)

		Industry group						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
	Total	*Food etc*	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc.*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Advantages of employing part-time workers										
Useful to be able to have them only when you need them	27.5	(28.8)	22.9	21.8	(47.8)	(21.9)	(35.2)	30.3	30.7	15.9
Useful if you can't get full-timers	23.2	(30.5)	30.5	21.8	(29.0)	(–)	(22.2)	13.4	22.6	37.2
Useful if job does not require full-time staff	18.8	(13.6)	22.1	5.5	(46.4)	(26.6)	(13.0)	19.7	18.1	19.5
Part-timers work harder, are more conscientious	12.2	(27.1)	13.0	12.1	(–)	(4.7)	(18.5)	11.3	10.8	16.8
Cheaper, keeps cost down	10.7	(15.3)	16.0	4.2	(1.4)	(6.3)	(29.6)	20.4	5.9	10.6
Provide better cover to make sure jobs get done	7.4	(23.7)	3.8	10.3	(1.4)	(–)	(5.6)	7.0	7.3	8.0
Able to work hours which suit firm	5.5	(11.9)	3.1	9.7	(–)	(3.1)	(1.9)	15.5	2.8	–
Useful if you need people with particular skills, experience	5.5	(1.7)	3.8	10.9	(–)	(6.3)	(3.7)	2.1	6.3	8.0
Better attendance, punctuality	5.0	(10.2)	.8	10.9	(–)	(3.1)	(–)	9.2	4.5	.9
More cover in case of absence	3.1	(–)	3.1	3.6	(–)	(4.7)	(7.4)	.7	2.4	8.0
Other answers	6.7	(1.7)	8.4	.6	(2.9)	(1.6)	(33.3)	.7	5.9	20.1
None	18.3	(18.6)	6.9	18.2	(13.0)	(60.9)	(1.9)	15.5	21.3	14.2
No opinion, not answered	4.2	(–)	5.3	7.3	(–)	(1.6)	(5.6)	6.3	2.4	6.7

Disadvantages of employing part-time workers (by age, terminal education age, attitude to equal pay and discrimination index)

		Age			*Terminal education age*			*Attitude to equal pay*			*Discrimination ind* *In favour of:*		
	Total	*39 & under*	*40–54*	*55 & over*	*15 & under*	*16–18*	*19 & over*	*For*	*Others*	*Three aspects*	*Any two*	*Any one*	*None*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	124	334	82	143	278	116	411	131	142	211	143	46
Unweighted figures	*212	50	120	40	40	114	55	157	55	60	83	50	19
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Disadvantages of employing part-time workers													
Lack of continuity, interruption in the flow of work	28.2	22.6	32.3	20.7	41.3	22.3	27.6	32.8	15.0	43.7	29.9	11.9	(23.9)
Too costly	18.3	17.7	18.0	20.7	28.0	16.5	11.2	17.0	22.6	19.7	17.5	14.7	(28.3)
It's a full-time job, requires full-time cover	17.2	16.9	14.7	28.0	20.3	19.1	9.5	18.8	12.8	21.8	18.0	13.3	(10.9)
Organisational, administrative difficulties	12.9	29.0	8.7	6.1	4.2	12.6	25.0	12.8	12.8	5.6	11.8	16.8	(28.3)
Cost of insurance stamps	12.2	13.7	9.3	20.7	14.7	13.0	6.9	10.6	17.3	14.1	14.7	9.8	(2.2)
Lack of interest, involvement, loyalty	10.1	7.3	9.6	17.1	21.0	7.6	3.4	15.6	3.0	9.2	11.8	9.1	(8.7)
Unreliable because of absenteeism	10.1	12.9	8.1	14.6	5.6	11.9	12.1	9.4	12.0	11.3	8.1	9.1	(19.6)
Disrupt, disturb full-time workers	6.3	.8	9.6	1.2	3.5	5.8	11.2	7.7	1.5	2.1	6.6	11.2	(2.2)
Don't work so hard, lower standard of work	5.2	2.4	5.4	7.3	14.7	1.8	.9	6.4	.7	4.9	8.1	2.8	(–)
Spend more, a lot of time training them	4.6	12.1	.6	9.8	7.0	4.7	1.7	3.0	9.0	–	5.7	.7	(26.1)
Would cause bad relations, resentment	3.9	.8	4.5	6.1	1.4	1.1	13.8	4.7	.7	.7	1.4	11.1	(2.2)
Causes problems of supervision	3.7	5.6	.6	8.5	.7	2.5	6.9	2.4	7.6	2.1	3.3	4.2	(–)
Lack of space, would need more space	3.0	–	4.8	–	9.1	–	2.6	1.0	9.0	2.8	–	8.4	(–)
More likely to leave, high turnover	2.6	5.6	2.1	–	2.1	1.4	6.0	2.7	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.1	(2.2)
Communication difficulties	2.2	4.0	1.2	3.7	–	2.9	3.4	2.7	.7	2.8	2.4	2.1	(–)
Other answers	12.5	24.1	10.0	8.5	–	15.1	22.4	13.8	12.0	12.0	11.8	16.8	(4.3)
None	14.9	12.9	17.7	7.3	8.4	21.2	6.0	12.4	22.9	11.3	14.2	14.7	(30.4)
No opinion, not answered	5.5	2.4	7.5	1.2	–	9.7	1.7	2.2	16.0	2.1	9.0	2.8	(8.7)

* Includes 2 formulators whose ages were not given and 3 whose terminal education age was not given (unweighted)

Disadvantages of employing part-time workers (by total number of employees, number of women, percentages of women and whether equal pay introduced)

	Total	*Total number of employees*			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*				*E.P. introduced*		
		249 or less	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*9% or less*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% or more*	*Yes*	*No*	*None doing same work*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215	189	255	98
Unweighted figures	212	63	71	78	98	70	44	38	58	50	66	58	115	39
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Disadvantages of employing part-time workers														
Lack of continuity, interruption in the flow of work	28.2	27.0	32.3	27.1	31.5	23.2	27.1	8.8	33.3	44.9	28.4	33.3	27.2	21.4
Too costly	18.3	20.7	15.7	13.5	16.9	22.7	11.9	4.4	20.2	20.4	23.7	20.6	15.0	21.4
It's a full-time job, requires full-time cover	17.2	20.7	11.8	12.5	20.9	13.8	8.5	10.6	29.8	25.5	10.2	11.1	24.8	8.2
Organisational, administrative difficulties	12.9	14.1	10.2	11.5	9.9	18.8	10.2	8.0	3.5	14.3	19.5	13.2	10.2	17.3
Cost of insurance stamps	12.2	10.0	16.5	13.5	11.9	9.9	20.3	4.4	16.7	19.4	10.7	5.3	20.9	3.1
Lack of interest, involvement, loyalty	10.1	11.9	12.6	13.5	11.9	5.0	15.1	17.7	14.9	13.3	7.9	19.6	11.8	–
Unreliable because of absenteeism	10.1	8.2	11.0	15.6	10.3	7.2	18.6	8.8	10.5	21.4	5.6	11.6	10.2	7.1
Disrupt, disturb full-time workers	6.3	9.7	2.4	–	4.6	11.1	–	10.6	.9	–	9.8	7.9	1.6	15.3
Don't work so hard, lower standard of work	5.2	5.3	6.3	3.1	7.0	2.2	5.1	–	7.0	4.0	7.4	7.4	5.1	1.0
Spend more, a lot of time training them	4.6	4.1	7.1	3.1	.3	12.7	1.7	–	2.6	4.0	8.4	1.1	4.3	12.2
Would cause bad relations, resentment	3.9	3.8	4.7	3.1	4.6	1.1	8.5	10.6	1.8	2.0	2.3	.5	3.1	12.2
Cause problems of supervision	3.7	2.8	5.5	4.2	1.3	4.4	6.8	1.8	2.6	5.1	4.7	1.6	5.1	4.1
Lack of space, would need more space	3.0	3.8	3.1	–	–	8.3	1.7	–	–	–	7.4	6.3	1.2	1.0
More likely to leave, high turnover	2.6	.6	6.3	4.2	1.7	3.3	5.1	1.8	2.6	5.1	1.9	2.1	3.9	–
Communication difficulties	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.0	3.3	–	1.8	.9	3.0	2.8	1.1	2.0	5.1
Other answers	12.5	15.0	12.6	8.3	10.6	16.6	10.2	4.4	9.9	3.0	20.9	18.0	12.6	11.2
None	14.9	18.7	3.1	18.8	17.6	13.3	6.8	33.6	7.8	9.2	11.6	7.4	18.0	21.4
No opinion, not answered	5.5	2.8	10.0	8.3	3.6	9.4	3.4	3.5	9.5	2.0	6.0	12.2	2.7	–

Disadvantages of employing part-time workers (by industry group and broad region)

	Total	*Industry group*						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
		Food etc	*Engineering*	*Textiles etc.*	*Trans. & communication*	*Commerce etc*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
All formulators WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Disadvantages of employing part-time workers										
Lack of continuity, interruption in the flow of work	28.2	(30.5)	27.5	40.0	(–)	(45.3)	(7.4)	27.5	27.5	31.0
Too costly	18.3	(40.7)	9.9	24.2	(–)	(29.7)	(5.6)	9.9	21.6	20.4
It's a full-time job, requires full-time cover	17.2	(16.9)	19.1	19.4	(8.7)	(18.8)	(14.8)	15.5	17.4	18.6
Organisational, administrative difficulties	12.9	(37.3)	13.0	7.3	(1.4)	(20.3)	(7.4)	14.1	12.5	11.5
Cost of insurance stamps	12.2	(16.9)	7.6	26.7	(–)	(1.6)	(1.9)	19.7	7.3	15.0
Lack of interest, involvement, loyalty	10.1	(6.8)	11.4	6.1	(27.5)	(18.7)	(11.1)	11.3	14.6	8.0
Unreliable because of absenteeism	10.1	(8.5)	6.9	10.3	(10.1)	(10.9)	(18.5)	12.7	8.4	11.5
Disrupt, disturb full-time workers	6.3	(–)	1.5	10.3	(–)	(–)	(27.8)	2.1	8.4	6.2
Don't work so hard, lower standard of work	5.2	(–)	3.1	4.2	(1.4)	(18.8)	(7.4)	2.1	7.3	3.5
Spend more, a lot of time training them	4.6	(20.3)	.8	7.3	(–)	(–)	(–)	4.2	6.3	.9
Cause bad relations, resentment	3.9	(–)	3.1	8.5	(–)	(–)	(5.6)	2.1	5.6	1.8
Cause problems of supervision	3.7	(18.6)	3.1	2.4	(–)	(–)	(1.9)	5.6	2.4	4.4
Lack of space, would need more space	3.0	(–)	2.3	7.9	(–)	(–)	(–)	.7	4.2	2.7
More likely to leave, high turnover	2.6	(8.5)	–	4.2	(–)	(–)	(3.7)	2.8	3.1	.9
Communication difficulties	2.2	(1.7)	.8	1.2	(1.4)	(–)	(13.0)	1.4	1.0	6.2
Other answers	12.5	(1.7)	18.3	7.2	(6.7)	(1.6)	(35.2)	5.6	9.7	39.8
None	14.9	(3.4)	19.1	2.0	(39.1)	(20.3)	(18.5)	20.4	13.2	12.4
No opinion, not answered	5.5	(5.1)	4.6	4.2	17.4	(3.1)	(–)	4.9	7.0	2.7

Chapter XV The first step towards equality

Introduction

The objects of the Equal Pay Act are:

"to eliminate discrimination between men and women in regard to pay and other terms and conditions of employment. This is to be achieved in two main ways;

(i) by establishing the right of the individual woman to equal treatment when she is employed: (a) on work of the same or a broadly similar nature to that of men:
(b) in a job which, though different from those of men, has been given an equal value to men's jobs under a job evaluation exercise; and

(ii) by providing for the Industrial Arbitration Board to remove discrimination in collective agreements, employers' pay structures and statutory wages orders which contain any provisions applying specifically to men only or to women only and which have been referred to the Board."

In this section we examine the extent to which equal pay had been introduced in the sampled establishments by early 1973.

Steps taken towards equal pay for men and women

This section of the questionnaire began with an open question to formulators:

"What steps have you taken towards equal pay in this establishment?"

This question was omitted when formulator and implementer were the same person, in order to keep the interviewer to a reasonable length.

The answers given by those asked the question are as follows:
(we also give answers based on all formulators in order to avoid giving a wrong impression of the extent to which steps have been taken.)

	All formulators	All asked
	%	%
Steps taken		
Already have equal pay	24.9	43.4
Have done, are doing, job evaluation	5.7	9.9
Differentials are being reduced	12.0	20.9
Already have equal pay for some women	2.0	3.5
Taking other steps	3.3	5.7
No steps yet taken	3.0	5.2
No men and women doing similar work	6.5	11.3
Not answered	42.6	–

The numbers are too small for detailed analysis. The answers to the next question give a better idea of the extent to which equal pay exists in the selected industries

How long equal pay has been in force in establishment

Not all formulators were asked the open question about steps taken towards equal pay and not all of those who did answer it stated specifically whether equal pay was in force for all or only some women doing the same or broadly similar work. All formulators were therefore asked the definitive question:

"Has equal pay for all men and women doing the same or broadly similar work been introduced in this establishment?"

Answers are given in detail in the tables which follow. In total they are:

		All establishments
		%
Whether equal pay introduced		
Yes:	less than two years ago	4.1
	two years but less than ten years	9.0
	ten years or more ago	3.7
	"Always had equal pay"	16.2
	Don't know when	1.9
	Total with equal pay	34.9
Equal pay NOT yet introduced		47.0
No women doing same work as men		18.1
	Total	100.0

These figures must not be taken as giving an indication of the situation in the work force as a whole. The sample was highly selective, in that it was confined to certain industries and to establishments with 100 or more employees. The industries which were excluded are mainly those where comparatively few women are employed, (except for national and local government) but small establishments account for a considerable proportion of the female work force.

We also show later that other individuals in establishments do not always agree with formulators' statements.

Comparatively few establishments have introduced equal pay in recent years: if we assume, as seems likely, that "always had equal pay" means for more than ten years, then nearly three-fifths of establishments with equal pay have had it in force for ten years or more. Only one-eighth have introduced it during the past two years (i.e. since the Equal Pay Act came into law).

The numbers of interviews in individual industries are too small to reveal significant differences between the percentages which have equal pay, apart from the difference between commercial establishments and most others. If we group together all manufacturing industries and the rest, we obtain the following where differences are significant.

	Manufacturing industries	*Others*
	%	%
Establishments which:		
Have equal pay	23.4	56.7
Have NOT equal pay	55.5	31.0
Have no women doing same work	21.1	12.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Whether equal pay has been introduced yet and, if so, for how long (by total number of employees, number of women and percentage of women)

		Total number of employees			*Number of women*			*Percentage of women*			
Establishments in which formulators were interviewed	*Total*	*Up to 249*	*250–499*	*500 or more*	*99 or less*	*100–249*	*250 or more*	*1–9%*	*10–24%*	*25–49%*	*50% & over*
WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	316	130	96	302	181	59	113	116	98	215
Unweighted figures	212	63	70	78	98	70	44	33	58	50	66
Whether equal pay introduced	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes: less than 2 years ago	4.1	6.0	1.5	1.0	7.0	–	1.7	.9	3.4	4.1	6.0
2 years but less than 5 years	7.7	9.8	4.6	5.2	11.3	3.3	3.4	8.9	6.9	7.1	7.9
5 years but less than 10 years	1.3	.9	2.3	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.7	.9	2.6	1.0	.9
10 years or more ago	3.7	6.0	–	1.0	6.6	–	–	15.9	1.7	–	–
"Always had equal pay"	16.2	15.2	24.6	8.3	9.9	29.3	8.5	–	10.3	22.4	23.7
Don't know when	1.9	2.8	–	1.0	3.0	–	1.7	2.7	5.2	3.1	.5
Total having equal pay	34.9	40.8	33.1	17.7	39.1	33.7	16.9	29.2	30.1	37.7	39.1
Equal pay NOT introduced	46.9	39.9	45.4	72.9	41.0	50.3	67.8	31.9	62.9	48.0	46.0
None doing same work as men	18.1	19.3	21.5	9.4	19.9	16.0	15.3	38.9	6.8	14.3	14.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Whether equal pay has been introduced yet and, if so, for how long (by industry group and broad region)

		Industry group						*Broad region*		
		Manufacturing								
Establishments in which formulators were interviewed	*Total*	*Food etc.*	*Engineering etc.*	*Textiles, etc.*	*Trans.& communication*	*Commerce etc.*	*Distribution*	*Central*	*Northern*	*Southern*
WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	542	59	131	165	69	64	54	142	287	113
Unweighted figures	212	29	71	64	15	14	19	67	84	61
Whether equal pay introduced	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes: les than two years ago	4.1	(6.8)	.8	.6	(–)	(25.0)	(–)	.7	4.5	7.1
2 years but less than 5 years	7.7	(1.7)	5.3	7.9	(–)	(28.1)	(5.6)	5.6	7.3	11.5
5 years but less than 10 years	1.3	(1.7)	2.3	1.8	(–)	(–)	(–)	1.4	.7	2.7
10 years or more ago	3.7	–	–	–	(29.0)	(–)	(–)	4.9	4.5	–
"Always had equal pay"	16.2	(8.5)	7.6	14.5	(26.1)	(25.0)	(27.8)	6.3	22.6	12.4
Don't know when	1.9	(–)	–	6.1	(–)	(–)	(–)	4.9	–	2.7
Total having equal pay	34.9	(18.6)	16.0	30.9	(55.1)	(78.1)	(33.3)	23.9	39.7	36.3
Equal pay NOT introduced	46.9	(42.4)	62.6	54.5	(26.1)	(20.3)	(50.0)	59.2	44.6	38.1
No women doing same work as men	18.1	39.0	21.4	14.5	(18.8)	(1.6)	(16.7)	16.9	15.7	25.7
Total	100.0	(100.0)	100.0	100.0	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	100.0	100.0	100.0

The number who have introduced equal pay within the past two years is too small for detailed examination, but if we compare establishments who have introduced it within the past five years with those who have had it in force for longer and those who have not introduced it we obtain the following:

	All establishments	*All*	*E.P. introduced :*		*Not yet introduced*	*No jobs same*
			Less than five years	*Five years or more*		
(Unweighted base figures)	(212)	(58)	(20)	(35)	(115)	(39)
Number of employees	%	%	%	%	%	%
249 or less	58.3	68.2	78.1	60.9	49.4	62.2
250–499	24.0	22.8	12.5	30.4	23.1	28.6
500 or more	17.7	9.0	(9.4)	8.7	27.5	9.2
Number of women employees						
99 or less	55.7	62.4	(85.9)	47.0	48.6	61.2
100–249	33.4	32.3	(9.4)	47.8	35.7	29.6
250 or more	10.9	5.3	(4.7)	5.2	15.7	9.2
Percentage of women						
9% or less	20.8	17.5	(17.2)	19.1	14.1	44.9
10–24%	21.4	18.5	(18.7)	14.8	28.6	8.2
25–49%	18.1	19.6	(17.2)	20.0	18.4	14.3
50% or more	39.7	44.4	(46.9)	46.1	38.8	32.6
Industrial group						
Food etc. manufacture	10.9	5.8	(7.8)	5.2	9.8	23.5
Engineering etc.	24.2	11.1	(12.5)	11.3	32.2	28.6
Textiles etc.	30.4	27.0	(21.9)	23.5	35.2	24.5
Transport & commun.	12.7	20.1	(–)	33.0	7.1	13.3
Commerce etc.	11.8	26.5	(53.1)	13.9	5.1	1.0
Distribution	10.0	9.5	(4.7)	13.0	10.6	9.2
Broad region						
Central	26.2	18.0	(14.1)	15.6	32.9	24.5
Northern	53.0	60.3	(53.1)	69.6	50.2	45.9
Southern	20.8	21.7	(32.8)	14.8	16.9	29.6

Percentages in brackets should be treated with caution.

The difference between the percentages of larger establishments (500 or more employees) among all those who have equal pay and those where it has not been introduced is just significant. In other words, equal pay is more likely to have been introduced in smaller firms, particularly during the past five years. It is also more likely to have been introduced in establishments with fewer than 100 women employees.

The industrial composition of establishments who have and have not introduced equal pay show some marked variations. Among all establishments with equal pay, textiles etc, transport and commerce together account for roughly three-quarters, while among those without equal pay, textiles etc. account for over one-third, transport for 7.1% and commerce for only 5.1%.

Establishments in the commerce group account for over half of those who have introduced equal pay during the past five years.

Establishments which have "always had" equal pay account for nearly half of all the establishments who have equal pay in force. A comparison between them and the rest of the equal pay establishments produces the following :

		"Always had" %	*Other E.P.* %
Total number of employees	249 & under	54.5	80.2
	250–499	36.4	10.9
	500 & over	9.1	8.9
Total number of women	99 & under	34.1	87.1
	100–249	60.2	7.9
	250 & over	5.7	5.0
Percentage of women	9% or less	3.4	29.7
	10–24%	13.6	22.8
	25–49%	25.0	14.8
	50% & over	58.0	32.7

Most of these differences are statistically significant. A possible theory might be that the establishments which have "always had" equal pay have done so by some peculiar set of circumstances whereas those where it has been introduced as a conscious act are mainly smaller firms with comparatively small numbers and percentages of women.

It is also interesting that there is a difference between the formulators from these two groups, in that only 65.9% of formulators from the "always had" group are in favour of equal pay, compared with 94.0% of the remainder. This strengthens the theory that establishments which have "always had" equal pay have done so by virtue of a historical accident.

Statements of other individuals at the same establishment

According to the statements of formulators, nearly one-fifth of establishments have literally no men and women doing "the same or broadly similar work".

The interpretation of this phrase is likely to differ between workers and employers and this survey provides some evidence of this in the establishments covered. The individuals interviewed were asked questions which enable some differences to be detected.

The questions are as follows:

Formulators of personnel policy were asked:

"Has equal pay for all men and women doing the same or broadly similar work been introduced in this establishment?"

First and second line managers were asked the same question in respect of the group supervised.

Men and women employees were asked:

"Are there any men (women) in this establishment doing the same or much the same work as you do?"

If yes: "Is their basic rate of pay more or less or the same as yours?"

Shop stewards (where they existed) were asked:

"Have you among your members any men and women doing the same or broadly similar jobs?"

If yes: "Do the women receive equal pay?"

In the table which follows the responses of other individuals are related to the statement of the formulator. The percentages are based on all establishments (weighted) and are therefore statistically valid (within the normal sampling limitations).

		Formulator's statement			
	Total	*Equal pay introduced for all*	*Equal pay not fully introduced*	*None doing same work*	*Not stated**
All establishments WEIGHTED	(561)	(189)	(254)	(98)	(20)
(unweighted figures)	(223)	(58)	(114)	(34)	(12)
	%	%	%	%	%
Establishments where:					
At least one second-line manager disagrees with formulator	7.6	12.7	–	19.4	–
At least one first-line manager disagrees with formulator	11.2	26.4	–	13.3	–
At least one woman employee disagrees with formulator	13.7	31.7	–	17.3	–
At least one man employee disagrees with formulator	5.7	10.6	–	12.2	–
At least one shop steward disagrees with formulator	8.0	18.0	–	12.2	–

*i.e. no formulator was interviewed.

These are the disagreements which it is possible to identify. In an establishment where the formulator has said that equal pay has been introduced for all men and women doing the same work the existence of opposing views is apparent when a manager states that equal pay has *not* been introduced for all men and women doing the same or broadly similar work in his group; where a man or woman employee claims to be doing the same work as members of the opposite sex and to be receiving a different rate of pay; or when a shop steward claims that any of the men or women for whom he is responsible are doing the same work as members of the opposite sex but are *not* receiving equal pay. In an establishment where the formulator has stated no men and women are doing the same work disagreement is apparent when any of these other individuals state that men and women *are* doing the same work. However, in establishments where the formulator has stated that equal pay has not been introduced for *all* men and women doing the same work, whatever answers are given by other individuals do not contradict this statement. (It is noteworthy that in fact very few individuals in such establishments claim to be receiving equal pay).

It must also be remembered that it was not always possible to interview all the individuals at an establishment. In particular, not all establishments had trade union organisation. Therefore the above figures are likely to understate the extent of disagreement.

Effects of introducing equal pay

Formulators from establishments where equal pay had been in force for 2 years or longer were asked what had been the effect of equal pay in the establishment. Those from establishments where equal pay was not in force, or had been introduced during the past two years were asked what they expected the effects to be. In both cases they were first asked an open question, followed by a series of questions on specific points. (Establishments which are said "always to have had" equal pay are not included because in such cases changes cannot be said to have occurred as a result of its introduction).

Answers to the open question are as follows:

	Formulators from establishments where :	
	E.P. has been in force for 2 years or more	*E.P. for less than 2 years or NOT E.P.*
	%	%
Effects or anticipated effects		
No effect	57.5	21.1
Cost firm more	–	36.0
Fewer women will be employed	–	17.5
Women would be expected to do same work as men	–	8.7
Men resent/will resent it	12.3	3.6
More women are/will be employed	11.0	.7
Women will be happier	–	6.5
More automation (employ fewer people)	–	2.9
More men will be unemployed	–	2.5
Greater division between men's and women's work, give women lower grade jobs	–	1.8
Unions will object	–	1.1
Other effects	8.2	13.5

The difference between the spontaneous answers of the two groups are quite marked. Of particular interest is the difference between the two on the point of the number of women employed. The experience of establishments with equal pay in force can be paralleled by that in national and local government since equal pay was introduced.

It is also interesting that a higher percentage of formulators have experienced male resentment than anticipate it. The national and local government experience is that very little male resentment has persisted.

It is surprising that none of the formulators from equal pay establishments mention the increased cost to the firm. Possibly after a time the additional cost is taken for granted.

The answer that women would be expected to do the same work as men when equal pay is introduced is given by a considerably higher percentage of formulators than is the conflicting answer that women would be relegated to lower grade jobs. (It has been claimed by unions that some employers are regrading jobs in order to evade the provisions of the Equal Pay Act).

The answers on specific points are as follows:

	Formulators from establishments where:	
	E.P. has been in force for 2 years or more	*E.P. for less than 2 years or NOT in force*
(Base)	(73)	(277)
(Unweighted base)	(24)	(122)
(Anticipated) effect on number of women employed	%	%
Has increased/will increase	17.8	11.6
Has remained/will remain same	72.6	54.5
Has decreased/will decrease	2.7	19.6
Don't know, not stated	6.9	14.3

	Formulators from establishments where :	
	E.P. has been in force 2 years or more	*E.P. for less than 2 years or NOT in force*
	%	%
(Anticipated) effect on range of jobs in which women are employed		
Has increased/will increase	19.2	7.3
Has remained/will remain same	74.0	66.5
Has decreased/will decrease	–	–
Don't know	6.9	14.6
(Anticipated) effect on opportunities for promotion for women		
Are/will be more	15.1	8.4
Are/will be the same	78.1	68.4
Are/will be less	–	8.0
Don't know	6.9	15.2
(Anticipated) effect on opportunities for training for women		
Are/will be more	8.2	14.2
Are/will be the same	84.9	70.9
Are/will be less	–	1.5
Don't know	6.9	13.4

Once again, anticipation and realisations are different. Those with equal pay for 2 years or more are on the whole more sanguine about its effects on women's working lives than are the others. This is only to be expected, because the points covered are all based on arguments which have frequently been used against the introduction of equal pay.

The exception to the greater optimism of those with equal pay for 2 years or more is in the case of training for women, where the percentage of these is less than that of the remainder. Statistically the difference is not highly significant, but the finding runs counter to those in respect of the other points and this may indicate that firms who are less eager to introduce equal pay are more likely to seek to increase the value of women as workers by training them for jobs from which they will get a better return.

In spite of the differences one should not lose sight of the fact that a substantial majority of both groups think there has been or will be no change in women's conditions in respect of any of these points.

The numbers in the sub-groups are too small for valid comparisons in the case of establishments which have had equal pay for two years or more. There are, however; some significant differences in the case of non-equal pay establishments. In answer to the open question, the percentage of formulators who are concerned about the anticipated cost of equal pay is significantly higher in establishments with 25% or more of women employees (46.6%, compared with 20.5% of those with less than 25%). Perhaps unexpectedly, formulators from establishments with larger numbers of women employees do not differ significantly in this respect from those in establishments with smaller numbers. Formulators in manufacturing industries are more likely than those in other industries to be concerned about the cost.

It will be remembered that formulators in establishments where equal pay has been in force for less than two years were asked for their opinions as to the anticipated effects, because it was believed that the full effects might not yet have become apparent. There are only 7 (unweighted figure) such establishments but it is noteworthy that the percentage who anticipate no further change (72.7%) is significantly higher than the corresponding percentage of formulators in non-equal pay establishments (16.6%). The percentage who anticipate no change is also higher in the case of all the specific points mentioned except for opportunities for training. Here the percentage anticipating an increase (59.1%) is considerably higher than the percentage of formulators in non-equal pay establishments (10.3%). Although the difference is barely significant it is so markedly unlike the answers given in respect of the other specific points by the same group of formulators that it is worth comment.

It would be unwise to deduce too much from such small numbers, but it can tentatively be said that the anticipation of unpleasant consequences after the introduction of equal pay is worse than the reality.

rade unions and equal pay

A comparison between establishments where trade unions are recognised and those where they are not reveals that there are only minor differences between the extent to which equal pay is in force.

		Establishments where:	
	Total	*T.U.'s recognised*	*T.U.'s NOT recognised*
(Weighted bases)	(542)	(459)	(83)
(Unweighted bases)	(212)	(189)	(23)
	%	%	%
Equal pay position			
Equal pay – less than 2 years	4.1	4.8	–
– over 2, less than 5 years	7.7	5.7	19.3
– over 5, less than 10 years	1.3	1.5	–
– 10 years or more	3.7	4.4	–
– don't know when	.6	.6	–
– "always had"	17.3	17.0	19.3
Total having equal pay	34.9	34.2	38.6
Equal pay not introduced	46.7	47.7	42.2
No women doing same work as men	18.5	18.1	19.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Looking at the figures another way, trade unions are recognised in 83.1% of establishments where equal pay is in force and in 86.2% of those where it is not.

It is necessary to repeat here that the sample did not cover a number of industries where equal pay is in force and where the extent of trade union recognition is almost, if not quite, 100%, for example, national and local government, education and a number of others.

Chapter XVI

Managements' suggestions for improving womens' opportunities

Introduction

A great deal of the responsibility for improving women's opportunities at work must rest with management, but both the Government and the trade unions are involved. In order to find out whether management believes its own responsibility is as great or less than that of these other bodies, formulators and implementers were asked what, if anything, in their opinion, could be done by the firm itself, the Government and the trade unions to improve women's opportunities.

Suggestions made by formulators and implementers

An interesting feature of the answers to questions is the high percentage who answer that "nothing can be done" by each of these bodies. Details of the percentage giving this answer in each of the sample groups are shown in the table which follows. Some of the more striking findings are mentioned here.

A lack of self-criticism can be detected. In all the sample groups, with one minor exception, the percentages of formulators and implementers who say the firm can do nothing greatly exceed the percentages who say the Government or the trade unions can do nothing. The most striking example of this occurs in the case of the commerce industrial group, where 39.1% of formulators and 51.6% of implementers think the firm can do nothing; the corresponding figures for the Government are respectively 1.6% and 3.1% and for trade unions none and none.

It is only to be expected that management representatives should be reluctant to admit that their firms are not doing all they could, but the magnitude of the percentages indicate that some kind of external pressure, such as legislation, may be necessary.

In most of the groups the percentage of implementers who think the firm can do nothing exceeds the corresponding percentage of formulators. Perhaps implementers feel more inhibited in expressing views which appear critical of the firm's policy.

5% of formulators and 10.3% of implementers think nothing can be done by anybody. It is perhaps interesting that only 1.1% of the formulators who do not combine this function with that of implementer, exhibit this degree of pessimism, compared with 12.9% of implementers-only.

Percentages answering *"nothing can be done"* by specific bodies.

		This firm:		*Government:*		*Trade unions:*	
		Formulators	*Implementers*	*Formulators*	*Implementers*	*Formulators*	*Implementers*
		%	%	%	%	%	%
All informants		45.8	54.9	17.5	26.5	13.5	23.5
Age	39 & under	55.6	50.8	16.1	26.7	5.6	22.5
	40-54	40.4	49.3	19.2	26.2	13.8	20.7
	55 & over	53.7	71.8	13.7	26.7	24.4	31.3
Terminal education age	15 & under	61.5	60.3	25.2	29.7	19.6	26.7
	16-18	38.8	53.3	16.2	24.2	11.5	22.5
	19 & over	42.2	43.1	12.0	22.2	11.2	16.7
Attitude to equal pay	For	43.2	53.2	19.0	27.9	15.8	21.4
	Others	54.2	62.6	13.0	26.3	6.0	33.3
Discrimination index	For: all three	26.8	48.3	19.7	24.9	9.2	18.3
	Any two	53.6	52.7	12.8	24.6	9.5	21.7
	Any one	51.7	61.0	23.0	35.3	24.5	30.1
	None	(50.0)	(78.8)	(15.2)	(9.1)	(10.9)	(36.4)
Total number of employees	249 or less	47.4	63.6	14.9	30.0	10.0	21.7
	250-499	49.2	50.0	16.9	18.4	20.0	30.1
	500 & over	35.4	34.4	27.1	26.3	15.6	20.2
Total number of women	99 or less	53.3	61.3	15.9	24.8	15.6	26.2
	100-249	35.4	49.5	17.1	28.8	8.8	18.5
	250 & over	39.0	40.3	27.1	27.4	16.9	25.8
Percentage of women	9% or less	45.1	60.0	18.6	38.2	15.0	38.2
	10-24%	38.8	51.2	18.1	21.1	20.7	30.1
	25-49%	41.8	46.5	18.4	18.3	6.0	9.1
	50% & over	51.6	58.3	16.3	27.3	12.1	19.0
E.P. introduced	Yes	51.9	61.1	18.0	31.4	15.9	31.4
	No	36.5	55.9	18.0	24.4	14.1	18.9
	None same	58.2	44.3	15.3	20.5	7.1	19.3
Industrial group	Food etc. manuf.	(55.9)	(31.1)	(15.3)	(14.8)	(18.6)	(11.5)
	Engineering etc.	36.6	55.6	19.8	27.0	17.6	32.5
	Textiles etc.	52.1	57.1	24.8	26.2	9.1	16.1
	Trans. & commun.	(56.5)	(68.0)	(18.8)	(42.7)	(17.4)	(50.7)
	Commerce etc.	(39.1)	(51.6)	(1.6)	(3.1)	(–)	(–)
	Distribution	(29.6)	(59.3)	(7.4)	(44.4)	(22.2)	(29.6)
Broad region	Central	52.8	64.5	12.0	21.0	12.7	18.8
	Northern	44.9	58.0	22.0	33.6	16.7	31.9
	Southern	38.1	35.7	12.4	14.8	6.2	7.8

Percentages in brackets should be treated with caution.

What the firm could do

This question was asked in respect of the *firm,* so that, where the establishment was part of a combine or other large organisation the informant could take into account measures which need not necessarily be confined to one establishment.

As already stated, appreciable proportions of formulators and implementers say the firm can do nothing. As a consequence, comparatively few mention any course of action, as the following shows:—

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
This firm should :		
Provide more, better, training facilities	16.2	17.5
Give women equal chance of getting jobs	15.1	6.1
Allow or encourage women to take higher level jobs	7.2	5.3
Change basic attitudes	3.9	3.3
Ensure women have equal pay	1.1	1.4
Provide child-care facilities	.4	1.1
Other things	4.8	4.5
Nothing as jobs are not suitable for women	5.7	5.8
Vague, irrelevant answers	8.1	4.0
Don't know	3.0	4.3
Nothing	45.8	54.9

(Note: answers such as *"train* women for better jobs" are included under "training".)

Apart from training and, in the case of formulators, giving women an equal chance of getting jobs, very few informants can suggest suitable measures.

Training heads the list of answers in all the sample groups except among implementers in the distributive trade, who put first "giving women an equal chance for jobs", and among formulators in the same trade who put first "encouraging women to take higher level jobs." Among both formulators and implementers in the distributive trade trainin receives a lower percentage of mentions than in other industrial groups.

What the Government could do

Because the percentages who say the Government can do nothing are appreciably lower than those who say the firm can do nothing, the answers about measures which could be taken are more diversified.

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
The Government should:		
Provide more training, make sure more training facilities are available to women	21.2	22.1
Take steps to change basic attitudes (e.g. in education)	16.1	9.8
Make sex discrimination illegal	13.8	7.1
Make senior jobs available to women (e.g. in Civil Service)	9.2	5.9
Ensure child-care facilities are available	6.3	8.0
Should give more publicity to opportunities available	6.1	3.6
Ensure that women get equal pay	3.1	6.0
Make trade unions co-operate	1.5	.7
Men's retirement age should be lowered	1.5	–
Other things	8.3	9.1
Vague, irrelevant answers	3.3	1.1
Don't know	13.3	16.7
Nothing	17.5	26.5

Provision of training facilities once again heads the list, but a number of other measures receive appreciable numbers of mentions. In fact, the percentage mentioning training is exceeded in some of the sample groups by the percentage mentioning the need for legislative measures or by the percentage mentioning the need to change basic attitudes.

Formulators and implementers are not always of the same mind and when they differ they do not differ consistently. It is perhaps worth noting that, although the individual figures differ, both formulators and implementers in commerce lay very little stress on the need to change basic attitudes, while in engineering and transport both formulators and implementers are more likely than others to emphasise the need for this.

The percentages of formulators and implementers who say "nothing" are lower than the corresponding percentages of formulators and implementers in the case of the firm and the Government (less so in the case of the latter).

	Formulators	*Implementers*
	%	%
The trade unions should:		
Accept women on equal basis, to assist them to participate in activities	44.3	31.3
Fight for women's rights as hard as they do for men's	14.9	12.1
Fight for equal pay	8.1	7.8
Change basic attitudes to women	6.6	3.8
Ensure women get equal training	5.0	8.2
Other things	4.2	2.9
Vague, irrelevant answers	6.6	5.6
Don't know	11.4	15.6
Nothing	13.5	23.5

As might be expected, the emphasis here is very different. Employers are possibly willing to blame the trade unions in order to protect themselves and it is therefore not surprising that the leading action suggested is that unions should accept women on an equal basis. There is not a great deal of variation in the percentage giving this answer (except that it is given by 67.6% of formulators in establishments with 250 or more women employees), which is perhaps unexpected in the light of the differing extent of trade unions organisation in the establishments.

Most of the answers given in respect of trade unions imply in one way or another that they are not treating their women members as seriously as they do the men.

It is well known that the decisions taken by trade union leadership are not always welcomed by members at workplace level. The Trades Union Congress and most of the leading trade unions in Britain have a national policy of equality for women as workers, but old suspicions die hard. It is therefore possible that formulators and implementers have had experience at workplace level of a lack of enthusiasm among trade unions for the introduction of women into jobs which were previously a male preserve.

What else could be done

After being asked what they thought three specific bodies – the firm, the Government, the trade unions – could do, informants were asked if they thought anything else could be done to improve women's opportunities in general.

Comparatively few think anything else could be done.

Other things which could be done	*Formulators* %	*Implementers* %
Basic attitudes should be changed, parents, teachers should encourage girls	10.3	13.0
Better education, training, for girls	3.3	3.1
Equal pay should be ensured	2.2	–
Child-care facilities should be improved	1.8	6.7
Other things	6.9	10.5
"It's up to women themselves"	10.9	5.8
Vague, irrelevant answers	–	.2
Don't know, not answered	10.4	6.7
Nothing else can be done	60.7	59.9

Most of these answers could be applied with equal justice to one or other of the three bodies already discussed. The exception is "it's up to the women themselves", which covers answers such as "they should train if they want promotion" (without any suggestion as to how training is to be obtained); "up to women to show they make equal employees"; "should get married later in life." Most of these once again show acceptance of the masculine norm.

Chapter XVII

Jobs done by men and by women

Introduction

A number of questions were asked about the nature of the job done by women at the establishments. These were designed to find out the extent to which men and women are doing the same king of work and the attitudes of management to employing women (or men) on types of work which they do not normally do at present.

Under survey conditions it is not possible to obtain from a manager sufficient detail about a large number of jobs to enable each job to be classified in great detail. In this section we have been able to use two forms of classification, as appropriate.

Where the nature of the question requires as much detail as can reasonably be given we have used the CODOT Minor Groups. Elsewhere we have used broad categories such as were used for the Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey at the time of this survey.

Men and women employed on the same or broadly similar work

Formulators were asked:

> "In which jobs here (i.e. at this establishment) are women employed on the same or broadly similar work to men?"

Their answers are shown in the table on the next page. Jobs have been coded according to the CODOT Minor Groups and the appropriate code numbers are shown alongside each.

As well as identifying areas where men and women are doing the same or broadly similar work, this question served as an introduction to subsequent questions dealing with training facilities available.

It should be borne in mind that the table which follows does not necessarily show the percentage of *establishments* which employ both men and women in a particular CODOT Minor Group. A formulator may have mentioned two or more different jobs which come in to the same group and these are all counted separately. To have eliminated all but one would have been to underestimate the relative importance of that CODOT Minor Group.

It is necessary to have some fixed yardstick to measure the relative proportions of the different jobs and therefore the following table is based on establishments. It should be interpreted as giving an indication of the importance of different kinds of jobs when considering the extent to which men and women do the same or broadly similar work. *The figure of 18.1% however, does represent the proportion of establishments in which no men and women are employed on the same work.*

Occupations in which women are employed on the same or broadly similar work to men (CODOT Minor Groups)

		Establishments in which formulators were interviewed *%*
03	Accounting, financial specialist	.7
04	Personnel and management specialist	3.3
05	Marketing, public relations	.6
06	Professional, supporting management	2.6
09,10,11	Instructing, health, welfare	1.2
15,16	Literary, artistic	3.6
17	Performing arts	3.3
21,22,23	Scientists, technologists	1.2
25	Related occupations in science and technology	5.9
27	Managerial (industrial operations)	5.4
28	Managerial (services)	10.0
31	Clerical	75.5
32,33	Shorthand, typing, office machine operating	2.2
34	Telecommunications operating	2.6
36	Selling occupations	3.7
37	Sales representatives	2.8
43	Food etc. preparing and serving	17.5
44,45	Personal service, caretaking, cleaning, etc.	8.2
46	Laundering, dry cleaning, pressing	2.4
53	Hide and skin processing	.2
54	Fibre and textile processing	17.2
57	Food and drink processing	1.5
59	Other materials processing	.2
63	Printing, photographic processing	.9
64	Bookbinding, paper working and paperboard products	3.5
65	Textiles, materials working	8.3
66	Leatherworking	7.9
68,69	Other making and repairing	3.7
71	Metal processing	1.1
72	Machining operations (engineering and metal goods)	5.7
73, 74, 75, 76, 79	Other fitting, wiring, installing operations (metal and electrical)	2.9
81	Painting	.7
82	Product assembling (repetitive)	5.0
83	Product inspecting, examining, sorting, etc.	8.9
84	Packaging, labelling	11.3
93	Road transport operating	.9
94,95	Materials handling, transport operating	4.1
99	Miscellaneous occupations	2.0
None		18.1

The *numbers* of men and women doing the same kind of work were not recorded. To have obtained such information in this kind of interview would have been impossible. Therefore, for example, one woman doing the same or broadly similar work as ten men managers counts the same in the table as 100 women doing the same work as five men clerks.

It is also necessary to remember that a job not done by both sexes may be done by men only or by women only. In most cases the evidence of other sources enables us to interpret the figures. For example, the absence of any mentions of the directors and managers group (CODOT 02) obviously means that there are no women in top management in the sampled establishments, while the small percentage of mentions of product assembling (repetitive) (CODOT 82) almost certainly means that comparatively few men are employed.

The interpretation of "same or broadly similar" work was left to the formulator himself. It is anticipated in many quarters that the interpretation of this phrase from the Equal Pay Act will lead eventually to difficulties and possibly even to litigation at a high level. Formulators of policy are unlikely to err on the side of overstatement so it is reasonable to assume that the table does not overstate the areas in which men and women are employed on the same or broadly similar work.

It is evident from the table that the principal area of overlap is in the clerical group of occupations (75.5%). No other group reaches a level as high as 20% and only four reach double figures. Some of the comparatively low percentages can be accounted for by the comparatively small numbers of establishments in which the particular type of worker is employed, for example, food preparing and serving, (CODOT 43), selling occupations (CODOT 37). (So far as the latter is concerned, however, in the distributive industry group they receive only 37.0% of mentions.)

Because the numbers in most individual CODOT Minor Groups are too small to produce meaningful results, for the purpose of more detailed analyses we have aggregated some of them into five reasonably homogeneous groups, as follows:

Managerial and supporting occupations (03-06, 09, 10, 11, 27, 28)
Clerical occupations (31)
Sales, selling occupations (36, 37)
Food preparing and serving occupations (43)
Manual occupations (53-59)

Taken together, those account for 87.0% of all mentions of *jobs* in which men and women are employed on the same or broadly similar work. The remaining Minor Groups are too heterogeneous to have any meaning if combined and there are too few in any one of them to have any validity of shown separately.

The following table, which is again based on establishments, shows for the different sample groups the extent to which men and women are employed in the same or broadly similar work in the five broad groups defined above. Except in the case of establishments where no men and women are employed on the same work the figures in the table should not be interpreted as literally giving the percentages of establishments in which men and women are employed on the same work in each broad group, but as indicating the relative importance of each group in this respect.

The table also shows the total percentages of jobs mentioned. The figures in this column can be regarded as giving a qualitative indication of the extent to which the same jobs are done by men and women in the different groups in the sample.

		Men and women employed on same work in:						
		Managerial etc. (03-06, 09, 10, 11, 27, 28)	Clerical (31)	Sales Selling (36,37)	Food preparation and serving (43)	Manual (53-99)	No occupations	Total percentage of "same jobs"
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All establishments		23.6	75.5	6.5	17.5	84.0	18.1	238.0
No. of employees	249 or less	12.9	75.9	2.2	22.6	69.6	19.7	206.6
	250-499	40.2	63.0	13.3	14.2	115.0	25.2	275.6
	500 & over	37.5	90.6	11.5	5.2	101.0	11.5	292.7
No. of women	99 or less	11.9	60.9	.3	24.8	60.9	21.2	178.1
	100-249	20.1	93.5	4.2	1.2	125.4	18.9	274.6
	250 & over	81.7	94.4	38.0	25.4	97.2	14.1	405.6
Percentage of women	9% or less	9.7	58.4	–	.9	15.0	39.8	92.9
	10-24%	24.6	93.0	–	1.8	84.2	7.9	234.2
	25-49%	16.0	68.0	2.0	14.0	114.0	18.0	258.0
	50% or more	34.0	78.6	15.3	36.3	110.7	15.8	306.9
E.P. introduced	Yes	29.6	85.2	9.0	44.4	63.0	–	282.5
	No	28.3	97.6	7.1	4.3	136.2	–	297.6
	None doing same work	–	–	–	–	–	100.0	–
Industrial group	Food etc. manf.	13.6	55.9	1.7	6.8	91.8	40.7	196.6
	Engineering etc.	13.0	78.6	–	1.5	85.5	21.4	193.1
	Textiles, etc.	18.8	61.2	1.2	–	170.3	14.5	277.0
	Transp. & commun,	(53.6)	(82.1)	(17.4)	(17.4)	(11.6)	(26.1)	(218.8)
	Commerce etc.	(7.8)	(120.3)	(–)	(110.9)	(–)	(3.1)	(295.3)
	Distribution	(55.6)	(72.2)	(37.0)	(11.1)	(35.2)	(18.5)	(229.6)
Broad region	Central	5.6	53.5	.7	.7	119.7	17.6	185.9
	Northern	31.4	84.3	8.7	27.9	76.7	17.1	267.9
	Southern	26.5	80.4	8.0	12.4	66.4	28.3	227.4

Not all the differences revealed by the table are statistically significant and many arise through the nature of the establishments themselves (e.g. one would expect variations in the percentages mentioning manual occupations among formulators in different industries). We will therefore comment only on occupations common to all industries, i.e. managerial and clerical, on total percentages and establishments with no occupations common to both sexes.

The percentage of managerial occupations is significantly higher in establishments with 250 or more women employees. This is not unexpected, but the magnitude of the difference is striking. Nearly two-thirds of them come from CODOT groups 27 and 28 (managerial occupations in industrial operations and services).

Once again establishments with 25-49% of women employees do not follow the trend in respect of managerial occupations.

In spite of the small numbers, the differences between the percentages of managerial occupations in commerce etc., on the one hand and in transport etc., and in distribution are significant. So too is the difference between the Central region and the others.

Variations are less marked in the case of clerical occupations. Possibly such as exist are as much due to certain jobs being done by women only, whereas in the case of managerial jobs it is likely in most instances that they are done by men only.

The percentages of establishments where no men and women are doing the same work do not follow any consistent pattern. The most striking figures are the high percentages in establishments with fewer than 10% of women and in food manufacture and the low percentages in establishments with 10-24% of women and in commerce.

The total percentages increase with increasing numbers of employees, numbers of women and percentages of women, presumably because, in general, the larger the establishment and the larger the numbers and percentages of women, the more jobs there are to be done.

Where men and women were employed on the same jobs formulators were asked:

> "Are any employees in each job given facilities to obtain further education or training, either by the firm or by some outside body?"
>
> If yes: "Do these facilities apply equally to men and women?"

The following table (in which percentages are to be read across) is based on "all jobs in which men and women are employed on the same or broadly similar work".

		Training facilities:				
		Same %	*Different* %	*None given* %	*Not stated* %	
All establishments		68.8	2.4	27.1	1.7	= 100%
No. of employees	249 or less	59.9	.4	36.3	3.4	
	250-499	75.1	6.6	18.3	–	
	500 or over	81.5	1.4	16.7	.4	
No. of women	99 or less	64.5	.9	30.6	4.0	
	100-249	59.3	5.4	35.1	.2	
	250 or more	92.0	.4	7.6	–	
Percentages of women	9% or less	77.8	2.0	20.2	–	
	10-24%	70.4	1.5	25.5	2.6	
	25-49%	56.6	–	37.6	5.8	
	50% or more	71.5	3.8	24.7	–	
E.P. introduced	Yes	72.3	3.6	20.6	3.4	
	No	66.3	1.6	31.6	.5	
Industrial groups	Food etc. manf.	77.6	–	22.4	–	
	Engineering etc.	60.3	4.5	35.2	–	
	Textiles, etc.	65.9	4.4	27.6	2.1	
	Transp. & commun.*	96.7	–	3.3	–	
	Commerce etc.*	46.0	–	47.6	6.6	
	Distribution*	88.7	–	11.3	–	
Broad region	Central	67.1	.4	32.6	–	
	Northern	68.4	2.5	27.0	2.1	
	Southern	71.6	4.3	21.8	2.3	

*Percentages in the transport, commerce and distributive groups are based on small numbers and should be treated with caution.

It should be remembered that these figures show only the extent to which training is provided for people working in certain jobs, i.e. those in which men and women are both employed. They should not be taken as indicating the extent to which training of any kind is provided.

The extent to which different training is provided for men and women does not vary significantly between the groups of establishments, whereas there are some significant differences in the extent to which training is provided *at all* for workers in these jobs.

The percentage providing training increases with number of employees and number of women employees, but there is little difference between establishments with different percentages of women except for the group with 25-49% women, where the percentage providing training is lower than in the other three groups. (This group appears to be a-typical in other respects, as shown elsewhere).

For the same broad groups as before, the extent to which training facilities are provided is as follows: (based on all jobs in each)

	Managerial	*Clerical*	*Selling*	*Food preparation & serving*	*Manual*
	%	%	%	%	%
Training					
Same for men and women	90.6	72.0	97.1	80.0	58.5
Different	–	1.7	–	–	5.2
None given	9.4	21.8	2.9	20.0	35.5
Not stated	–	4.5	–	–	.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The form of the question related to training given to men and women actually in the jobs, so that the training would usually be to fit them for better jobs.

The higher percentages among manual occupations where no training is given for either sex may well be due to the fact that the CODOT Minor Groups included in this group are not individually homogeneous and include both skilled and unskilled workers. Skilled work in these groups would most often be done by men who would have served their apprenticeships, while semi and unskilled work would be done by women, who would not perhaps be considered for training.

It is perhaps unexpected that training facilities are said to be provided for a majority of all jobs which are done by both men and women and that this applies to all types of establishment. A possible explanation may be that the question asked about *any* employees, not *all*, and therefore if only a small proportion were offered facilities the answer would be in the affirmative.

The number of jobs where facilities for the sexes are said to differ is too small for analysis. Only 9 formulators (weighted figure) described different forms of training.

tegories of work in which omen are never employed

The categories in which any workers (of either sex) were employed were recorded by the interviewer. Formulators were asked, in respect of any category in which males were employed but not females:

> "Do you ever employ women or girls in this category?"

The following summary shows:

a) The percentage of *establishments employing any workers* in a category which *never employ women or girls* in that category.

b) The percentage of establishments which *employ any workers* in that category

c) The percentage of *all establishments* which *never* employ women in each category.

	(a) %	*(b)* %	*(c)* %
Non-manual			
Managers	50.1	93.5	46.8
Supervisors	28.9	77.1	22.3
Engineers, scientists, technologists	65.7	45.2	29.7
Technicians	50.7	52.8	26.8
Office staff	.8	96.9	.9
Sales staff	39.6	50.7	20.1
Manual			
Supervisors and foremen	44.9	80.1	36.0
Sales staff (1)	(47.5)	7.4	3.5
Catering, domestic	3.3	68.1	2.2
Skilled (2)	81.0	77.9	63.1
Apprentices etc. (3)	62.8	38.2	24.0
Semi-skilled (2)	38.9	72.5	28.2
Unskilled (2)	48.0	69.9	33.6
Transport workers	89.0	23.4	20.8

(1) The percentage in brackets in this line is based on only 16 establishments.

(2) The definitions are those used in the DE's New Earnings Survey, namely:
Skilled i.e. either (a) a craftsman in an occupation to which the normal method of entry is by apprenticeship or equivalent training or (b) a worker in an occupation where skill is acquired by considerable experience or where a minimum of 6 months' training is essential

Semi-skilled i.e. in an occupation needing between 1 and 6 months' experience and/or training before becoming reasonably proficient.

Unskilled i.e. in an occupation needing no instruction or where less than 1 month's training or instruction is required.

(3) Apprentices etc., include learners and trainees for manual occupations.

In terms of percentages of establishments which employ workers in a category, transport workers come first on the list of those in which women are never employed, but in terms of all establishments, skilled manual workers come first, followed by managers. (Transport workers, apart from those employed in the transport industry, are mainly van and lorry drivers).

These are some marked differences between the groups within the sample in the extent to which establishments employ women or girls in that category.

We deal first with non-manual categories and show below the *percentages of establishments employing any workers in a category* who *never* employ women.

		Non-manual category (1)				
		Managers %	*Supervisors* %	*Scientists* %	*Technicians* %	*Sales* %
Attitude to E.P.	For	55.2	32.6	70.2	61.6	42.3
	Others	35.4	14.5	52.5	(15.6)	(31.0)
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	44.9	51.2	68.6	61.5	31.7
	Any two	68.0	24.2	68.2	46.9	24.3
	Any one	45.7	24.0	97.2	66.1	60.9
	None	(39.0)	(14.3)	(94.6)	(10.7)	(16.7)
Total number of employees	Up to 249	53.4	33.3	69.4	67.2	48.9
	250-499	46.7	25.9	69.7	43.5	31.7
	500 and over	44.0	21.8	55.9	31.9	27.8
Total number of women	99 or less	62.8	43.1	73.6	60.6	51.7
	100-249	39.2	13.7	56.2	47.3	32.2
	250 or more	21.7	14.3	(50.0)	(20.0)	(10.3)
Percentage of women	9% or less	71.6	45.3	82.7	50.0	(84.4)
	10-24%	60.7	55.1	62.7	61.7	41.9
	25-49%	61.3	21.3	(55.8)	45.5	37.9
	50% and over	28.0	10.0	(54.9)	41.3	22.8
E.P. introduced	Yes	50.3	29.8	78.4	38.1	17.4
	No	50.6	24.5	64.5	64.7	47.3
	None doing same work	47.9	43.4	56.4	38.2	(68.8)
Industry group	Food etc. manufacture	(26.5)	(38.5)	(23.3)	(7.3)	(40.7)
	Engineering etc.	65.1	38.6	72.1	55.1	47.8
	Textiles, etc.	45.7	34.8	65.8	67.7	45.6
	Transp. and commun.	(53.2)	(24.6)	(100.0)	(30.8)	(7.7)
	Commerce etc.	(59.6)	(5.9)	(87.5)	(20.0)	(–)
	Distribution	(37.0)	(6.3)	(*)	(83.3)	(26.1)
Broad region	Central	62.3	42.3	67.6	68.7	50.0
	Northern	43.2	23.1	61.3	46.4	34.2
	Southern	52.3	26.3	(74.5)	36.9	35.6

(1) Office staff omitted because members insignificant. Percentages in brackets are based on small numbers and should be treated with caution.
* No scientists employed.

As far as the more senior positions are concerned, the table underestimates the extent to which women are excluded. Frequently the number of men employed, for example, as managers, greatly exceeds the number of women.

A striking feature of the table is the finding that, in establishments where the formulator is in favour of equal pay the percentages which never employ women in the three most senior categories (managers, supervisors, scientists) are considerably higher than in the rest. We have shown elsewhere that by no means all formulators who are in favour of equal pay are also in favour of having more women in senior positions. The finding under discussion appears to be a practical illustration of the earlier finding.

Not unexpectedly the percentages which never employ women in senior positions decrease, often quite markedly, with increasing numbers and percentages of women employees and also, to some extent, with increasing total numbers of employees. However, even among establishments with over 50% of women employees, over one-quarter never employ women managers.

The numbers are too small in individual industries for firm conclusions to be drawn, but it can tentatively be said that food etc. manufacturing establishments are more likely than others to employ women in senior positions. The establishments in the Northern region are more likely than either those in the Central or Southern regions to employ women in senior positions.

Technicians occupy what may be called an intermediate position in the job hierarchy, in that they are not normally of supervisory or management status but their work requires some specialised knowledge, including possibly a qualification. The extent to which they are employed follows a similar pattern to that of more senior jobs, with exceptions among establishments employing less than 10% of women, establishments where equal pay has been introduced and in the Southern region.

The category "sales staff" includes two distinct types of worker: the "sales representative" and the "shop assistant" types. For most establishments except those in the distribution industry the former description would apply. The extent to which women are employed as sales staff increases with increasing number of employees, number of women employees and percentage of women employees. It is also higher than average in establishments where the formulator is opposed to equal pay and in the Southern region. In this respect this category follows the same pattern as senior posts in general. In contradistinction to senior posts, however, women are more likely to be employed as sales staff in establishments where equal pay has been introduced.

We now deal with workers in manual categories.

The following shows the *percentages of establishments employing any workers in each manual category* who *never* employ women.

		Manual category (1)				
		Foremen	*Skilled*	*Apprentices*	*Semi-skilled*	*Unskilled*
		%	%	%	%	%
Attitude to E.P.	For	48.4	85.3	67.2	39.4	54.0
	Others	38.8	68.4	50.0	36.7	28.9
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	57.9	86.4	80.6	46.3	73.0
	Any two	50.3	77.6	63.8	53.0	40.9
	Any one	28.5	75.8	47.8	24.3	41.8
	None	(22.6)	(84.1)	(66.7)	(20.0)	(19.4)
Total number of employees	249 or less	50.4	91.5	51.1	49.1	59.5
	250-499	35.0	64.2	67.6	23.9	41.2
	500 or over	41.2	75.0	79.5	29.4	31.0
Total number of women (2)	99 or less	61.8	89.4	67.1	51.0	66.3
	100-249	26.3	72.8	57.5	15.0	29.8
	250 or more	(14.5)	(59.3)	(55.8)	(31.1)	(25.0)
Percentage of women	9% or less	74.5	92.0	81.4	68.0	72.2
	10-24%	76.2	87.6	81.0	52.3	59.0
	25-49%	32.4	68.4	61.2	20.3	23.2
	50% and over	13.0	74.4	29.1	13.6	37.3
E.P. ntroduced	Yes	51.1	82.8	47.4	32.5	46.7
	No	43.3	82.3	66.4	27.8	45.1
	None doing same work	40.0	75.8	74.5	80.8	55.9
Industry roup (2)	Food etc. manufacturing	(43.6)	(100.0)	(88.9)	(51.9)	(7.5)
	Engineering etc.	64.8	73.8	66.4	41.9	45.7
	Textiles etc.	28.3	75.3	53.0	24.8	54.5
	Transp. and commun.	(100.0)	(97.5)	(100.0)	(82.1)	(95.5)
	Commerce etc.	(2.0)	(91.3)	(7.1)	(27.8)	(100.0)
	Distribution	(38.5)	(73.9)	(50.0)	(41.7)	(51.5)
Broad egion	Central	62.8	83.6	61.7	54.4	38.8
	Northern	29.9	82.4	59.8	23.8	53.5
	Southern	54.2	74.2	71.4	48.3	50.0

(1) The definitions used for skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled are those which were used in the DE's New Earnings Survey.

(2) Percentages in brackets are based on small numbers and should be treated with caution.

Foremen and supervisors classed as manual may supervise skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled workers, or any combination of the three. It is usually a prerequisite that first-line supervisors of skilled craftsmen should themselves be craftsmen. It follows that, in any situation where even a small proportion of the workers are skilled craftsmen, the supervisor is likely also to be skilled.

This kind of situation is not uncommon in manufacturing industries. Facilities for obtaining the necessary skills (e.g. by apprenticeships) have been almost completely non-existent for women in the past, so that women who aspire to supervisory posts of this nature do in fact suffer a double discrimination: they are prevented from acquiring skills by discrimination at an earlier stage and again suffer from the kinds of prejudice against women in supervisory posts which have been revealed by this survey.

The percentage of establishments employing manual foremen which do not employ women in this capacity decreases with increasing number and percentage of women employed. It is higher in establishments where the formulator is in favour of equal pay and in those where equal pay has been introduced. In spite of the small numbers some of the differences between industries in this respect are significant, particularly those between transport etc. at the one extreme and commerce etc. at the other.

The position is more favourable (from women's point of view) in the Northern region than in either the Central or Southern.

The definition of "skilled" is that used in the Department of Employment's New Earnings Survey, namely, either a craftsman in an occupation to which the normal method of entry is by apprenticeship or equivalent training, or a worker in an occupation where skill is acquired by considerable experience or where a minimum of 6 months' training is essential. Very few women classed as skilled would come under the first part of the definition.

Bearing in mind this definition, the high proportion of establishments which do not employ any skilled women workers is even more striking. In all groups the proportion is greater than one-half and in some it reaches almost 100%.

The term "apprentices" includes learners and trainees. In almost every group the percentage who do not employ female apprentices is lower than the percentage who do not employ skilled women, often very much so. It does not seem likely that this represents an increase in the opportunities for training for women (evidence from sources such as the Industrial Training Boards indicates that in most industries there has been no marked increase).

The definition of "semi-skilled" is "an occupation needing between one and six months' experience and/or training before becoming reasonably proficient". That of unskilled is "an occupation needing no instruction or where less than one month's training or instruction is required."

Employing women as semi-skilled or unskilled manual workers cannot be regarded as an item on the credit side so far as non-discrimination is concerned, unless one accepts the doctrine that to be allowed to work at all is non-discrimination against women.

As a general rule the percentage in any group who do not employ women on semi-skilled work is less than that who do not employ women on unskilled work and very much less than the percentage who do not employ women on skilled work.

Reasons for not employing women in certain categories

Although there are differences between the reasons given for not employing women in different categories, there are some common threads running through all categories, as the following tables show (we deal with non-manual workers first).

	Non-manual category (1)				
	Managers	*Supervisors*	*Scientists etc.*	*Technicians*	*Sales staff*
(Unweighted bases)	(100)	(49)	(74)	(54)	(41)
	%	%	%	%	%
Unprompted reasons					
Physical reasons	4.7	13.2	5.6	2.1	6.4
Dirty job, bad working conditions	5.5	2.5	9.3	–	10.1
Hours unsuitable (2)	7.5	7.4	2.5	2.8	2.8
Women less effective than men	22.8	5.0	3.1	2.8	18.3
Reasons of modesty	4.3	1.7	–	.7	–
Shorter period of service	4.3	1.7	–	.7	–
No opportunity for women to be promoted	1.6	5.8	–	2.1	–
No women have applied	20.1	9.1	24.2	25.5	28.4
"Always been a man's job"	50.8	69.4	51.6	67.6	51.4
Other reasons	9.5	1.8	3.1	.7	1.8
Vague answers	.4	1.7	8.1	.7	.9
Prompted reasons					
Pay	3.5	5.0	5.0	–	.9
Qualifications, skills not appropriate	63.8	54.5	64.6	62.8	62.4
Training not possible	9.4	–	1.9	.7	2.8
Training costs too high	5.9	2.5	4.3	5.5	.9
Physical attributes	24.8	21.5	22.4	9.7	14.7
Other attributes	15.0	9.9	3.1	2.1	3.7
Union objections	2.8	7.4	6.2	2.8	.9
Other workers might object	18.1	14.0	6.8	4.1	4.6
None of these	11.8	33.1	16.8	33.1	30.3

(1) Office workers are omitted because the number is insignificant.
(2) Includes one mention of nightshift in each of 3 categories.

"Prompted" answers were obtained by showing the informant a card listing the prompted reasons (it is possible that there may be a little duplication in the case of manual workers, because a spontaneous answer subsequently coded as "physical" may be different from the informant's prompted idea of "physical attributes").

A majority of formulators give the spontaneous answer for every category that it has "always been a man's job". In terms of logic this does not really answer the question, because it is in effect saying "we employ only men on this job because we have always employed only men", which invites the further question "why have you done so?" It is, however, an answer indicative of the strength of the traditionalist approach to admitting women to fields of employment where they have not customarily worked in the past. Undoubtedly many of those who gave this answer spontaneously subsequently mention lack of skills or qualifications. Taken over all non-manual categories the next most important spontaneous answer is that no women have applied for the job. Had time permitted it would have been interesting to find out whether the ways in which jobs are advertised internally or externally are such as to encourage or to deter women from applying.

It is noteworthy that effectiveness is mentioned spontaneously by significantly higher percentages in respect of managers and sales staff than in respect of the other non-manual categories. Usually this criticism is non-specific.

The most important prompted answer is undoubtedly the one already mentioned– that women have not the appropriate skills or qualifications, followed by physical attributes.

Training difficulties are mentioned by comparatively few formulators, even after prompting, and then mainly in connection with managerial posts. This may merely indicate that for these categories of jobs firms do not envisage training. That is to say they expect the people appointed to have already acquired the necessary expertise.

The objections of the trade unions are named less frequently than the objections of other workers. The latter are principally mentioned in respect of managerial and supervisory posts.

Looking at the answers as a whole it can be said that the two biggest obstacles to appointing women to posts in these categories are, firstly, the "traditionalist" attitude, which is perhaps harder to combat by legislation than any other, and secondly, women's lack of skills and qualifications, which could only be overcome by giving women the opportunity to acquire these skills. This would do little to help the present generation of ambitious women but might help future generations, provided the innate prejudices against women could be overcome.

The following are the reasons given for never employing women in certain manual job categories.

	Manual category (1)					
	Foremen etc.	*Skilled*	*Apprentices etc.*	*Semi-skilled*	*Unskilled*	*Transport workers*
(Unweighted bases)	(73)	(133)	(95)	(58)	(67)	(42)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Unprompted reasons						
Physical reasons	31.8	28.7	16.1	51.0	53.8	46.9
Dirty job, bad working conditions	7.2	9.1	13.2	2.6	13.7	1.8
Hours unsuitable (2)	4.6	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.3	10.6
Women less effective than men	29.2	6.1	6.3	10.5	14.3	22.1
Reasons of modesty	–	7.0	8.6	–	–	–
Shorter period of service	–	7.0	8.6	–	–	–
No opportunity for women to be promoted	1.5	–	–	–	–	–
Union objections	–	5.6	2.3	2.0	2.7	1.8
No women have applied	9.7	9.9	32.2	11.1	6.6	16.8
"Always has been a man's job"	28.2	48.5	31.6	19.0	19.8	22.1
Other reasons	1.5	2.9	5.7	11.8	5.5	7.1
Vague answers	1.0	.6	2.3	3.9	.5	–
Prompted reasons						
Pay	2.1	1.5	1.1	–	–	–
Qualifications, skills, not appropriate	32.8	42.4	38.5	36.6	13.2	35.4
Training not possible	2.1	7.3	10.3	10.5	3.8	.9
Training costs too high	.5	2.0	8.6	1.3	.5	.9
Physical attributes	37.4	39.5	53.4	45.8	57.7	39.8
Other attributes	10.8	4.1	4.0	2.6	2.2	8.8
Union objections	9.2	7.9	6.3	2.0	1.1	.9
Other workers might object	14.4	9.4	13.2	5.2	7.7	6.2
None of these	32.8	27.5	28.2	23.5	29.1	15.0

(1) Categories with insignificant numbers are omitted.
(2) Includes one mention of nightshift.

The traditionalist approach is in evidence again in relation to manual jobs, particularly for skilled work. Possibly some of the formulators who give this answer have forgotten (or are too young to remember) that many women did skilled craftsmen's work during World War II.

It should be remembered that this survey did not cover industries such as construction or mining in which there are many physically heavy jobs. While there are undoubtedly some physically demanding jobs in the industries covered it is fair to say there are also a number of skilled jobs which do not require any greater physical strength than that required for the semi-skilled and unskilled jobs in which women are employed in the same workshop or factory. The employment of young people under 18, whether they be boys or girls, is regulated by law, which covers the physical conditions of their work. The high percentage of mentions of physical conditions in connection with the non-employment of girls as apprentices etc. appears to imply that some boy apprentices are working under conditions which are not suitable.

We have said elsewhere that the educational achievements of boys and girls up to the age of 16 are very similar. Since this is the level at which most apprentices and learners enter industry, the high percentage of mentions of inadequate qualifications is difficult to understand.

Union objections and those of other workers are of greater importance in the case of manual workers than of non-manual, particularly so far as supervisors, skilled workers and apprentices are concerned. The declared policy of the Trades Union Congress and of most major unions in this country is in favour of more and better opportunities for women, including apprenticeships and training for skilled work. The national policy of unions, however, does not always permeate down to the rank and rile and there have been instances in recent years of rank and file objections to the appointment of women to better jobs even where the men's leaders have been in favour. There are still a few unions which will not admit women to the trades they represent. At times when unemployment threatens this kind of opposition is likely to become stronger. It is not only management who will have to be convinced of the case for non-discrimination.

Women with suitable qualifications

Formulators who had advanced the reason that no women had suitable qualifications or skills were asked whether, if a woman with the necessary skills or qualifications applied for a vacancy, she would be considered.

The following are the answers given (percentages read across).

	Whether a suitably qualified woman would be considered:			
	Yes, definite	*Yes, if no man available*	*No*	*Not known*
	%	%	%	%
Non-manual categories				
Managers	78.7	12.9	7.7	.7 = 100%
Supervisors	67.2	–	32.8	–
Scientists, engineers, technologists	70.9	16.5	12.6	–
Technicians	70.2	23.8	6.0	–
Sales staff	49.2	20.6	30.2	
Manual categories				
Foremen, supervisors	30.2	15.9	54.0	–
Skilled	49.6	10.8	39.6	–
Apprentices etc.	43.3	4.5	52.4	
Semi-skilled	48.1	1.9	50.0	–
Transport	59.0	23.1	17.9	–

Some of these are based on small figures but it is possible to deduce tentatively that, apart from sales staff, employers would be more likely to admit suitably qualified women to non-manual than to manual jobs. The low percentage who would accept suitably qualified girls as apprentices etc. is disquieting.

Jobs which cannot be done by the opposite sex

Formulators were asked:

> "Do you think there are any jobs in this establishment which NO woman could do?"
>
> "Do you think there are any jobs which NO man could do?"

Those answering "yes" are:

		There are jobs which:	
		NO woman could do	*NO man could do*
		%	%
All formulators		63.4	14.4
Age	39 & under	64.6	26.8
	40-54	60.8	9.0
	55 & over	64.9	14.3
Terminal education age	15 & under	53.8	15.4
	16-18	60.4	11.5
	19 & over	81.9	20.7
Attitude to equal pay	For equal pay	70.1	16.0
	Others	39.8	9.0
Discrimination index	For: all three aspects	65.5	7.7
	Any two	69.2	14.2
	Any one	64.3	25.3
	None	(28.0)	(2.0)
Total number of employees	249 or less	61.7	12.3
	250-499	60.8	14.6
	500 & over	73.0	21.0
Number of women	99 or less	74.2	13.2
	100-249	40.9	9.9
	250 or more	78.0	34.0
Percentage of women	9% or less	65.5	4.4
	10-24%	75.0	8.6
	25-49%	68.0	15.0
	50% & over	54.0	22.8
Equal pay introduced	Yes	55.6	16.9
	No	65.7	14.2
	None doing same work	66.3	10.2
Industry group	Food etc. manufacturing	(55.9)	(6.8)
	Engineering etc.	81.7	9.9
	Textiles, etc.	62.4	12.1
	Transp. & communication	(24.6)	(–)
	Commerce etc.	(68.8)	(40.6)
	Distribution	(63.0)	(27.8)
Broad region	Central	71.1	12.0
	Northern	54.7	15.3
	Southern	70.8	15.0

The findings here are very important because they reveal the kinds of basic discriminatory attitudes which are touched on in a number of places in this report. Nearly two-thirds of those responsible for personnel policy think they are jobs which no woman could do, compared with only one-seventh who give a similar answer in respect of men.

Some of the differences between groups are what one might expect; for example, the lower than average percentage saying there are no jobs which a woman could not do in formulators from establishments with more than 50% of women employees, accompanied by a higher than average percentage giving this answer in respect of men. The high percentage of formulators in the engineering industry is also not unexpected, unlike the low percentage in transport (significantly lower than in almost all other industrial groups).

A surprising finding is undoubtedly the difference between formulators in favour of equal pay and those not in favour. The percentage of the former who think there are jobs which no woman could do is significantly higher than the percentage of the latter. A possible explanation may be that many of those who are in favour of equal pay are only so because they think there are comparatively few jobs in their establishments which women could do as well as men. Looking at it another way, many of those not in favour of equal pay may hold this opinion because there are many jobs which women could do in their establishment in order to qualify for equal pay.

The difference between those not in favour of any aspects of equality and the others is also interesting. An explanation is not easy to find, but as the percentage in respect of men as well as that in respect of women is also significantly lower it may merely be that this very small group are comparatively inarticulate.

Details of jobs which could not be done by the opposite sex

It proved extremely difficult to classify the jobs which formulators think could not be done by a woman or by a man. Descriptions had of necessity to be brief and the information given was often not adequate to classify in detail. The most satisfactory classification was found to be the CODOT minor groupings and these have been used. In the following summaries the CODOT code numbers are given alongside the descriptions and the order is that of CODOT. It should be added that although the classification is the best possible under survey conditions it does not in many cases give an exact idea of the kinds of jobs in mind. (Percentages are based on all establishments).

		%
Jobs which NO woman could do		
00	Managerial (general management)	2.2
04	Personnel management	.6
17	Performing arts	2.2
25	Professional occupations in science etc.	.4
27	Managerial (industrial)	5.2
28	Managerial (services etc.)	2.8
36	Selling occupations (distributive trade)	.7
37	Sales representatives	1.5
41	Security	1.3
43	Food and beverage preparing, serving, etc.	.7
44	Personal service attendants	2.6
45	Caretaking, cleaning etc.	1.7
50	Farming, horticulture	2.2
53	Skin etc. processing	.4
54	Fibre and textile processing	9.8
56	Chemical etc. processing	.7
57	Food and drink processing	4.6
58	Wood processing etc.	.7
59	Other materials processing	4.2
62	Clay and stone working	2.8
63	Printing etc.	1.7
65	Textile materials working	1.3
67	Woodworking	2.8
68	Rubber and plastic working	.7
69	Other making and repairing	2.2
71	Metal processing	5.9
72	Machining (engineering)	7.0
73	Production fitting (metal)	3.7
74	Installing and maintaining	13.7
75	Production fitting and wiring	1.1

		%
76	Installing and maintaining (electrical)	2.4
77	Pipe, sheet and structural metal working	5.2
79	Other metal and electrical	1.5
81	Painting etc.	.6
83	Product inspecting etc.	1.5
84	Packaging etc.	2.4
86	Construction	2.8
93	Road transport operation	7.4
94	Civil engineering etc.	3.1
95	Transport operating, materials moving etc.	17.5
99	Miscellaneous occupations	17.7
	Others (CODOT 05, 16, 22, 31, 34, 46, 61, 82, 97, one mention of each)	1.7

Most of the individual percentages are small and because of this and the heavy weighting already described too much reliance should not be placed on the exactness of individual percentages. The summary, however, does give an idea of the range of jobs of which women are thought by management to be incapable and the relative importance of different types of jobs in the list.

If we compare the preceding list with the one which follows, it appears evident that different criteria are being used in assessing the capabilities of men and women. The jobs which men are believed to be unable to do are mainly those which a man might lose face in doing.

		%
Jobs which NO man could do		
11	Health diagnosing and treating	.7
32	Shorthand, typewriting	2.6
36	Selling occupations (distributive trade)	2.4
43	Food and beverage preparation etc.	.6
44	Personal service attendants	5.4
45	Caretaking, cleaning	3.0
65	Textile, materials working	.9
71	Metal processing	.4
82	Product assembling (repetitive)	.4
97	Other machine operating	.4
	Others (CODOT 10, 28, 31, 54, 57, 83, 84, one mention each)	1.3

The numbers are small and the nature of the jobs are such that any analysis of the reasons why a man could not do these jobs would be meaningless. Suffice it to say that the largest number of mentions is secured by the answer that it would not be suitable for a man to do such jobs as women's cloakroom attendant, followed by men's lack of dexterity.

Reasons why formulators think NO woman could do certain jobs

The numbers of individual jobs mentioned are for the most part too small to permit separate analysis of the reasons why formulators think women incapable of doing each job. In the table which follows we therefore show a summary of all the reasons given by formulators who think there are jobs which no woman could do, together with reasons given in respect of groups of jobs which it seems reasonable to combine. Even grouping jobs, however, does not always produce unweighted bases of sufficient size to be wholly reliable.

There are some findings, however, which are fairly conclusive in spite of the small numbers. Firstly the physical effort required to do the job is the reason most often given except in the case of managerial occupations. For most job groups this reason outweighs all others. There is no indication in the answers classified under this heading that the jobs are outside the limitations imposed by law and at least some assessments must be subjectively made. Some of the jobs so described were in fact done by women during the 1939-45 war.

The next most important reason taken overall is that classified under the heading "always been a man's job", which includes answers implying that women have never entered this kind of work. This response to some extent begs the question because it does not attempt to explain why this is so. It is interesting as an illustration of basic attitudes.

One-third of the formulators who think women could not do managerial jobs give as their reason that women lack necessary qualities.

The old bogeys of trade union opposition, limitations on night shift and on working hours receive comparatively few mentions, except for the last-named in connection with managerial occupations.

There is some evidence in the reasons given that formulators are thinking more in terms of the generality of women than in terms of an individual woman with suitable characteristics. Quite possibly the generality of men could not do some of the jobs either.

Whether a woman could be trained

Where lack of training, experience or a similar reason was advanced as a reason why women could not do a job, formulators were asked whether a woman could be trained to do the job. The numbers who specifically mention training are too small to provide any detailed information, but it is worth noting that in 69.6% instances formulators think women could be trained.

Whether the job could be modified

Formulators were also asked in respect of each job which they think could not be done by women whether it could be modified so that a woman could do it. Details are given in the table which follows. It can be seen that, in the vast majority of cases, formulators believe such modifications to be impossible. The one exception is in the materials processing group, where in three-fifths of instances formulators think modifications possible. It was not feasible to lengthen the interview by pursuing the point, so it is not possible to say whether informants are taking economic considerations into account when assessing the possibility of modifications.

Reasons why formulators believe NO woman could do certain jobs

	All jobs mentioned	*Types of jobs (grouped) **							
		Managerial etc. (00-28)	*Materials processing (not metals) (53-59)*	*Making & repairing (not metals) (61-69)*	*Processing etc (metal & elect.) (71-79)*	*Painting, packing, building etc. (81-86)*	*Transport (91-95)*	*Miscellaneous (99)*	*Others (31-50, 97)*
Formulators naming each job									
WEIGHTED (base for percentages)	818	75	111	63	219	40	152	96	62
unweighted figures	345	29	46	20	107	19	61	35	28
Reasons	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Physical reasons, too heavy	76.7	(28.0)	74.8	(95.2)	74.4	(90.0)	96.1	76.3	(72.6)
Dirty job in itself	4.2	(–)	6.3	(3.2)	7.3	(2.5)	3.3	3.1	(–)
Bad working conditions	4.8	(–)	18.0	(1.6)	1.4	(7.5)	2.0	3.1	(9.7)
Not allowed to do nightshift	1.6	(1.3)	9.0	(1.6)	–	(–)	.7	–	(–)
Hours are unsuitable	2.9	(17.3)	3.6	(–)	1.8	(–)	–	–	(4.8)
Women lack necessary qualities	6.0	(34.7)	1.8	(–)	5.0	(–)	–	1.0	(30.6)
Union won't allow women	.6	(–)	.9	(4.8)	.5	(–)	–	–	(–)
Dangerous	2.0	(–)	.9	(–)	2.7	(5.0)	2.0	–	(6.5)
"Always has been man's job"	17.8	(41.3)	34.2	(–)	18.7	(2.5)	4.6	21.9	(11.3)
Other answers	5.1	(20.0)	5.4	(–)	4.1	(2.5)	2.0	–	(12.9)
Whether job could be modified so that a woman could do it									
Yes	21.4	(10.7)	60.4	(20.6)	13.7	(10.0)	14.5	19.8	(19.4)
No	74.9	(89.3)	35.1	(77.8)	79.9	(90.0)	80.9	79.2	(77.4)
Don't know	3.7	(–)	4.5	(1.6)	6.4	(–)	4.6	1.0	(3.2)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* The numbers in the headings of the columns refer to CODOT

Chapter XVIII Employers' associations and trade unions

Introduction

In some establishments personnel policy may be determined solely by the views of the management of the establishment. There are, however, a number of other factors which may influence policy.

If the establishment is part of a larger organisation or combine, policy may be determined at national level and applied with varying degrees of uniformity to all the establishments in the organisation. In such cases any changes in policy would, in principle, be decided outside the establishment and we therefore interviewed the formulator of policy at national level.

The establishment may be a member of an employers' association which arrives at a common policy which is binding to a greater or lesser extent on its members.

If any trade unions are recognised by the establishment, personnel policy may be influenced by the attitude of the trade unions and the pressure they are able to bring to bear on management.

The establishment may be party to agreements arrived at between an employers' association and one or more trade unions. In such cases the management of the establishment might have to accept policies which were beyond its direct control.

There are so many possible situations that a survey such as this could not investigate them in detail. However, some questions were included in order to ascertain to what extent personnel practices towards women might be influenced by employers' associations and trade unions. The pressure which could be applied by such bodies might have a pronounced effect on the success or otherwise of anti-discrimination measures.

Membership of employers' associations

Formulators were asked whether the firm (i.e. the undertaking of which the establishment formed a part or the whole) is a member of any employers' association.

In 55% of establishments the whole firm belongs to an association and in a further 9.4% part of the firm, including the establishment, belongs. Thus, a total of 64.4% of establishments are members.

The only differences between groups which are significant are as follows :

		Establishments which are members %
Attitude of formulator to equal pay	For	69.4
	Others	48.2
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	42.4
	Engineering etc.	69.5
	Textiles, etc.	81.2
	Transport & communications	(43.5)
	Commerce etc.	(48.5)
	Distribution	(70.4)
Broad region	Central	76.1
	Northern	63.8
	Southern	51.4

The difference between the establishments where formulators are in favour of equal pay and those where they are not is particularly interesting in the light of the finding that there is little difference in this respect between establishments where equal pay has been introduced and those where it has not. Few employers' associations have declared themselves in favour of equal pay, so it may possibly be concluded that the associations in general are less progressive than some of their members.

The employers' association is naturally related to the industry of the establishment. The only one mentioned by an appreciable number is the Engineering Employers' Federation, to which half the establishments in the engineering group belong, as well as a few in other industry groups.

Trade unions recognised

The percentages of establishments in which any trade unions are recognised are as follows:

		%
All establishments		84.7
Total number of employees	249 or less	77.3
	250–499	93.1
	500 or more	97.9
Number of women	99 or less	83.8
	100–249	83.5
	250 or more	93.2
Percentage of women	9% or less	92.0
	10–24%	100.0
	25–49%	71.0
	50% and over	78.6
E.P. introduced	Yes	83.0
	No	85.9
	None doing same work	85.2
Industrial group	Food etc. manufacture	76.3
	Engineering	89.3
	Textiles, etc.	91.5
	Transport & communication	(100.0)
	Commerce etc.	(79.7)
	Distribution	(48.1)
Broad region	Central	82.4
	Northern	90.2
	Southern	73.5

The differences between establishments with fewer than 250 employees and those with 250 or more, between those with less than 25% of women employees and those with 25% or more, and between establishments in distribution and those in other industries are significant. That is to say, trade union recognition is less likely to be found in smaller establishments, those in which women predominate and in the distributive trade.

The trade unions recognised depend to a great extent on the industrial group to which the establishment belongs. When considering the following figures it must be remembered that a number of industrial groups are excluded from the sample.

		Industrial group							
		Manufacturing				*Non-manufacturing*			
	Grand Total	*All*	*Food, etc.*	*Engineering,*	*Textiles* etc.*	*All*	*Transport etc.*	*Commerce etc.*	*Distribution*
Unions recognised	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	15.3	12.1	23.7	10.7	8.5	21.9	–	20.3	51.9
AUEW	24.9	36.3	25.4	63.4	17.0	4.8	7.2	6.3	–
TGWU	19.6	20.5	28.8	19.1	17.6	18.7	39.1	4.7	9.3
EEUPTU	18.5	23.6	22.0	28.2	19.4	9.6	2.9	10.9	16.7
ASTMS	13.5	20.7	13.6	30.5	14.5	.5	–	1.6	–
TASS	12.0	17.0	6.8	42.0	–	3.2	8.7	–	–
NUGMW	10.3	11.5	16.9	22.1	.6	8.6	5.8	18.8	–
APEX	6.5	9.2	5.1	19.8	1.8	1.6	1.4	–	3.7
UCATT	5.7	8.4	10.2	8.4	7.3	1.1	–	3.1	–
Clothing, footwear & textile unions (TUC) Ø	10.2	15.8	–	–	33.3	–	–	–	–
Printing & publishing trades unions (TUC) Ø	10.0	14.7	3.4	3.1	27.0	1.6	–	4.7	–
Other metal unions (TUC) Ø	5.0	6.4	3.4	11.5	10.9	2.7	1.4	6.3	–
Other unions (TUC) Ø	19.2	12.1	33.9	6.9	7.9	33.2	47.8	31.3	16.7
Non-TUC unions Ø	7.9	2.6	6.8	3.1	.6	18.2	39.1	6.3	5.6

*This group has been described throughout as "textiles etc." for the sake of brevity. However, it does include a few printing and publishing establishments.

Ø There is some duplication within these groups: i.e. one establishment may recognise more than one union in a group and is therefore counted twice.

We have already said that the extent of trade union recognition is below average in smaller establishments, in those which women predominate and in the distributive trades. The same is true of the extent to which individual unions are recognised, with the exception that the textile unions are more widely recognised in establishments where women predominate.

National or district agreements between employers' associations and trade unions

A question which had to be omitted when one person combined the functions of formulator and implementer was one which asked whether the firm was party to any agreements negotiated between an employers' association and a trade union. Because of the comparatively small numbers, all that can be said is that 66.5% of those who were asked the question say that the firm is party to such agreements.

Negotiating with the unions

Formulators and implementers were asked whether they personally negotiated (or participated in negotiations) with trade unions *on the question of women's wages and salaries.*

The following shows the percentages of formulators and implementers who negotiate:

a) *in all establishments*
b) *in establishments where trade unions are recognised.*

		Industrial group							
		Manufacturing				*Non-manufacturing*			
	Total	*All*	*Food, etc. manf.*	*Engin-eering etc.*	*Textiles, etc.*	*All*	*Trans-port & com-mun.*	*Com-merce etc.*	*Distri-bution*
	%	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
a) Formulators	29.2	39.7	37.3	45.8	35.8	9.1	(–)	(21.9)	(5.6)
Implementers	21.9	29.8	18.0	37.8	28.1	7.3	(–)	(18.8)	(3.7)
b) Formulators	34.4	45.0	48.9	51.3	39.1	11.6	(–)	(27.5)	(11.5)
Implementers	25.8	33.7	23.4	42.5	30.6	9.2	(–)	(23.5)	(7.7)

The difference between manufacturing and non-manufacturing industries is striking.

It was not possible to pursue the matter further and find out who does in fact negotiate on the question of women's wages in those establishments where neither the formulator or implementer does so. In the transport and communications group, for example, trade unions are recognised in every establishment, but formulators and implementers do not negotiate in any. A possible explanation may be that many establishments, particularly in the transport group, are covered by national agreements negotiated by employers' associations or by a combine as a whole, and formulator and implementer do not participate directly.

It can be concluded that both national and local negotiators are likely to be important in the operation of anti-discrimination measures.

Appendix I **Note on the sample design**

1 Introduction

Following the initial decision that this multi-population study should be based on a sample design where groups of members from each population under study are considered as comprising "units" and a representative sample of such units is required in order that between population comparisons can be made relating to given situations a method of sample selection was sought which could be implemented within the analytical, economic and time constraints imposed.

2 Sample requirements

A sample of approximately 400 establishments was set in the hope of achieving full responses from approximately 280. Within responding establishments, interviews were to be sought from representatives of the following populations:

i) Persons responsible for formulating 'employment policy'.
ii) Persons responsible for implementing 'employment policy'.
iii) Second line managers.
iv) First line managers.
v) Male employees.
vi) Female employees.
vii) Shop stewards.

3 Sample design

The sample design adopted was a multi-stage stratified cluster design with systematic random selection at the first three stages. This results in data being additive, with a minimum of reweighting (see 9) down to the third stage of selection. Thereafter the sample design imposes certain analytical constraints.

4 Selection of Primary Sampling Units

DE Local Employment Exchange areas were taken as primary sampling units and, after stratification, a sample of 40 was selected systematically with uniform probability. The sample was required to provide sufficient numbers within 3 broad geographical strata for separate analyses. The strata were as follows:

	Standard Regions
I Area of "relatively high unemployment"*	Scotland, North, N.W.
II Area of "relatively low unemployment"*	South East (incl. GLC)
III Area of "medium unemployment"*	E & W Midlands, E. Anglia, Yorkshire and Humberside, South West, Wales.

The sampling frame for the selection of primary sampling units was a list of all Employment Exchange areas in England, Scotland and Wales LESS those selected at random for the Workplace Industrial Relations Surveys 1971 and 1973. On those surveys, all establishments employing 250+ employees and 100-249 in the Distributive Trades had been approached in all areas selected, and it was considered that co-operation on both 1973 projects would be seriously jeopardised by dual approaches. Since these exclusions from the frame have been made systematically from a random start, there is no reason to believe that this will cause bias to enter the data.

The distribution of selected primary sampling units between strata was as follows:

Stratum	No. of Selected EES
Relatively high unemployment Areas	15
Relatively low unemployment Areas	10
Medium unemployment Areas	19
Total	44

5 Selection of Second Stage Units

Each of the selected primary sampling units was contacted and asked to supply certain information for every establishment within its area which a) employed 100 or more employees and b) had an MLH 211 to 499 inclusive; 702 to 832 inclusive; or 881 to 899 inclusive. The decision to include in the sampling frame establishments from certain industries only was taken in order to exclude establishments where the question of employment policy regarding women in particular was affected by special circumstances e.g. the mining industry or the civil service. The establishments in the sampling frame were stratified by the number of persons employed. A systematic selection was made from within each stratum using variable sampling fractions between strata. The sampling fractions were determined by i) the necessity for sufficient establishments to be selected within each stratum for analysis purposes and ii) the necessity to minimise reweighting factors. The distribution of the sample by stratum is shown in the following table:

Distribution of the sample of establishments by stratum

Region Group* \ No. of employees	100-249	250-499	500-999	1000+	Total
Group I	26	44	68	23	161
Group II	51	46	18	8	123
Group III	24	45	34	15	118
Total	101	135	120	46	402

*See Section 4 for definition.

6 Selection of Third Stage Units

Stages of selection subsequent to the selection of the second stage units were carried out by S.S.D. interviewers within the selected establishments. It was felt neither feasible nor reasonable to ask establishments to supply S.S.D. HQ with all the information necessary, and so sampling was carried out on-the-spot. The third stage units were "departments" within establishments. A "department" was defined as a unit which functions separately within an establishment and is headed by the person who has responsibility for and actually deals with the majority of technical and staff matters which relate to the functioning of that unit. This person is called the "head of department" and he must work at the selected establishment and not outside it.

Within each selected establishment departments with 10 or more employees were identified and one or two were selected at random using the following scheme:

---

*As described by the Department of Employment

No. of depts. in establishment	Sampling Fraction
1	$\frac{1}{1}$
2	$\frac{1}{1}$
3	$\frac{1}{2}$
4	$\frac{1}{2}$
5	$\frac{1}{3}$
6	$\frac{1}{3}$
7	$\frac{1}{4}$
8	$\frac{1}{4}$
9	$\frac{1}{5}$
10+	$\frac{1}{5}$

The decision to limit the number of departments selected per establishment to 2 was based on the desire not to jeopardise co-operation by imposing a large number of desired interviews on any one establishment.

7 Selection of individuals

i) Persons responsible for formulating employment policy at the selected establishment.

These were identified and selected for interview. In the vast majority of cases only one such person at an establishment fulfilled this role. Where there was more than one, the interviewer was instructed to conduct multiple interviews if a person with ultimate responsibility could not be identified.

ii) Persons responsible for implementing employment policy (for women) at the selected establishment.

These were identified and selected for interview. In many cases they were the same persons as at i) above and interviewers were instructed in these circumstances to conduct a combined interview. Subsequent selection of individuals occurred within selected departments, with each department being considered independently.

iii) First Line Managers (Foremen/Supervisors) *

Within each selected department one foreman/supervisor responsible for 4 or more employees was selected at random, regardless of how many such eligible persons were identified.

iv) Second Line Managers

These were identified as the person to whom the selected foreman/supervisor was responsible for matters of work allocation and quality and the supervision and discipline of workers/employees. In some departments no second line manager was identified, or his identify coincided with that of the formulator and/or implementer.

v) Male Employees

From a list of all male workers/employees (excluding known shop-stewards) responsible to the selected foreman/supervisor, two male employees were selected at random. If there were only one or two such employees in the appropriate foreman group, then these were automatically selected for interview.

vi) Female Employees

As in v) above but for female employees.

vii) Shop Stewards

If the selected department was unionised i.e. the management recognised trade unions for negotiating purposes, the shop steward(s) representing the selected male and female employees were identified and included for interview.

8 Probabilities of Selection

a) Primary Sampling Units (Areas)

Probability of selection of the i^{th} p.s.u. in the j^{th} stratum

$$= \frac{1}{a} \qquad \text{———} \quad 1$$

b) Second Stage Unit (Establishments)

Probability of selection of the k^{th} second stage unit in the i^{th} p.s.u.

$$= \frac{1}{x_{ik}} \qquad \text{———} \quad 2$$

Where $1 \leq x_{ik} \leq 12$

c) Third Stage Unit (Departments)

Probability of selection of the 1^{th} third stage unit in the k^{th} second stage unit

$$= \frac{1}{yik1} \qquad \text{———} \quad 3$$

Where $1 \leq yik1 \leq 5$

d) All Subsequent Units

Although all subsequent stages of selection can be expressed in numerical probability terms it is neither necessary or desirable that they should be so expressed as this sample design aimed at producing only a representative sample of units and not individuals (see section 1).

Overall Probability of Selection of Departments and Departments

Overall probability of selection of any establishment.

$$= 1 \times 2$$

$$= \frac{1}{a} \times \frac{1}{x_{ij}} \times \frac{1}{yijk}$$

9 Reweighting

a) In order that establishment, formulator and implementer data can be additive a reweighting factor of x_{ij} must be applied.

b) In order that department data can be additive, a reweighting factor of x_{ij} yijk must be applied.

c) No other data are additive.

---

* A foreman/supervisor is defined as the first supervisory level above the workers/employees with some responsibility for and who actuallydeals with the allocation and quality of work and the supervision and discipline of the workers/employees.

Appendix II (a) Information about numbers employed, obtained at sampling stage

TABLE 1

ESTAB: .... SERIAL NO: ☐

	Category	Numbers employed in each category							
		Men		Boys		Women		Girls	
		Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
	Managers								
NON-MANUAL	Supervisors & foremen (non-manual)								
	Engineers, scientists, technologists								
	Technicians								
	Office staff (non-manual)								
	Sales staff (non-manual)								
	Other non-manual (describe)								
MANUAL	Supervisors & foremen (manual)								
	Sales (manual)								
	Catering, domestic & other services (manual)								
	Skilled manual craftsmen								
	Skilled, manual apprentices, learners, improvers, trainees								
	Semi skilled manual								
	Unskilled manual								
	Other manual (describe)								
	Workers not classifiable above (describe)								

Appendix II (b) Questions asked of formulators and implementers

Note: Where the same person fulfilled the functions of formulator and implementer, it was not possible to ask the whole of both questionnaires. In these cases questions marked * were omitted; many of these are common to both.

The background information questions which follow were common to both and were asked at the end of the interview in all cases.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (both formulators and implementers)

Household composition (relationship to informant, age, sex, marital status and employment status of individuals in informant's household).

At what age did your full-time education finish?

Have you passed any examinations, apart from the school's own examinations, since the age of 13?

If yes What examination(s) did you pass?

Has *this firm* ever given you any training, either a general training or for a particular job?

If Yes – for particular job

For what jobs have you been given training by this firm?

What kind of training were you given?

Trade apprenticeship

Trade learnership

Professional training on the job (nursing training, articled to accountants, solicitors, etc.)

Firm's own training scheme

Government training scheme

Informal training on the job

Other (specify)

How long did training given by the firm last?

Have you ever had any formal training for *any* job (apart from that given by your present firm)?

Have you had training in one kind of job or in more than one kind?

Occupation & industry in which training has been received.

What kind of training was it?

PROMPT
AS
NECESSARY

- Trade apprenticeship
- Trade learnership
- Professional training on the job (nursing training, articled to accountant, solicitor etc.)
- Firm's own training scheme
- Government training scheme
- Other (specify)

How long did it last?

Do you belong to a trade union or staff association?

If Yes

Which union (staff association) is this?

MARRIED WOMEN AND WIDOWS ONLY

Do you pay the full National Insurance contribution or the special contribution?

INFORMANTS WITH CHILD(REN) AGED 11 OR MORE STILL IN F/T EDUCATION

Introduce: Many parents have some idea about the sort of education and careers they would like their children to have, particularly the older children.

RECORD name, sex and age of *all* children aged 11 or more still in f/t education

ASK IN RESPECT OF EACH CHILD AGED 16 OR MORE STILL IN FULL-TIME EDUCATION

Is (name) still at school or is he/she in full-time further education?

If in further education

What kind of further education?

ASK IN RESPECT OF EACH CHILD AGED 11 OR MORE STILL AT SCHOOL

Do you expect (name) to go on to further education?

If Yes What kind of further education?

If No Why don't you expect (name) to go on to further education?

ASK IN RESPECT OF EACH CHILD AGED 11 OR MORE IN FULL-TIME EDUCATION

What kind of a job would you like (name) to do when he/she has finished his/her education?

ALL WOMEN INFORMANTS

Have you always worked ever since your full-time education finished?

IGNORE any period when unemployed, seeking work, or sick intending to return to work or short periods of two months or less.

If No	When did you *first* give up work?	19 ....
	Why did you give up work at that time?	Got married First child was born Second or other child born Other (specify)
	PROMPT AS NECESSARY, CODE ONE ONLY	
	When did you *last* start work again?	19 ....

Would you have liked to start work again earlier?

If Yes (i) Why did you not do so?

(ii) Is there anything which might have helped you to start work again sooner?

ALL INFORMANTS

Ten years ago, that is in (January) (February) 1963, were you:

Working (including unemployed seeking work or sick intending to return)

RUNNING PROMPT

In full-time education

Other (specify)

If not working: When did you subsequently start work?

ASK FOR SHORTEST PERIOD GIVEN IN ALTERNATIVE WORDINGS:

Can you tell me how many employers you have worked for during the *PAST TEN YEARS*/since you started work/since you resumed work?

ALL WOMEN INFORMANTS

Do you think you will give up work (again) in the future or do you expect to work continuously until retirement age?

If give up work When do you expect to give up work?

Do you think you will resume work again?

If Yes Do you think that when you resume work you will then go on working until retirement age?

MARRIED WOMEN INFORMANTS:

I'm going to read out a list of household tasks. Would you tell me for each one, whether your husband does any of this?

Roughly how much .... does your husband do:
a quarter or less, about a half, more than half, all?

Preparing/cooking meals
Washing up/drying up
Washing/ironing/mending
Other housework
Care of children
Shopping/running errands
Household decorations and repairs
Gardening
Other tasks (specify)

Taken overall, what proportion of the household tasks would you say your husband does:
A quarter or less; about half; more than half; all?

How does your husband feel about your going out to work?

Would you say that on the whole he:

RUNNING PROMPT

strongly approves
approves
has no strong feelings either way
disapproves
strongly disapproves?

Don't know, can't say

What is your husband's occupation?

MARRIED MEN INFORMANTS:

I'm going to read out a list of household tasks. Would you tell me for each one, whether you do any of this regularly?

Roughly how much ,.................................... do you do?
A quarter or less, about a half, more than half, all?

Preparing/cooking meals
Washing up/drying up
Washing/ironing/mending
Other housework
Care of children
Shopping/running errands
Household decorations and repairs
Gardening
Other tasks (specify)

Taken overall, what proportion of the household tasks would you say you do?
A quarter or less; about half; more than half; all?

IF WIFE WORKS

What is your wife's occupation?

How do you feel about your wife going out to work?

Would you say that on the whole you:

RUNNING PROMPT

strongly approve
approve
have no strong feelings either way
disapprove
strongly disapprove?

Don't know/can't say

IF WIFE DOES NOT WORK

Is your wife likely to do any paid work in the future?

If Yes (i) When do you think this might be?

(ii) When she goes out to work do you think you will help her more with the housework?

How would you feel about your wife going out to work?

If she went out to work, would you say that on the whole you would:

RUNNING PROMPT

strongly approve
approve
have no strong feelings either way
disapprove
strongly disapprove?

Don't know

ALL INFORMANTS

We've talked a great deal about men and women at work. Is there anything else you would like to say about the subject?

Appendix II (c) Questions asked of formulators

Person responsible for formulating personnel policy at top level (for both men and women)

Post held by informant

To whom is informant responsible?

Sex of informant

How many people are employed by this firm?

What is the main product or activity of this establishment?

Is the firm, or part of the firm, a member of any employers' association?

If Yes Which employers' associations?

*Is the firm a party to any national or district agreements, that is, agreements negotiated by any employers' association with any trade unions?

If Yes *(a) Which employers' associations with which unions?

*(b) Are these agreements national or district?

Which trade unions are recognised by this establishment?

*Have you any agreements negotiated locally, i.e. by this establishment, with any trade unions? (Include domestic and local agreements)

If Yes *(a) With which unions?

*(b) In respect of which categories (as described in Table 1) and sex of employees?

Now I'd like to talk about conditions of employment at (establishment). From Table 1, record all categories where males employed but not females, and ask: We have been told there are no women or girls employed here at present as (each category).
Do you ever employ women or girls in this category?

Ask in respect of each category in which women or girls are never employed.

(a) Why do you not employ women or girls in this category?

Now show card and ask (b) in respect of each such category.

(b) apart from what you've already mentioned, would you say you are influenced by any of the following?

Pay

qualifications or skills are normally not appropriate

training not possible

training costs too high

physical attributes not appropriate

other attributes not appropriate

union objections

other workers object

No

If "qualifications or skills normally not appropriate"
or similar answer at (a) ask (c)

(c) If you had a vacancy in this category and a women or girl with the necessary skills or qualifications applied for it, would you consider her for the job?

In which jobs here are women employed on the same or broadly similar work to men?
Are any employees in (each job) given facilities to obtain further education or training, either by the firm or by some outside body?

If Yes: Do these facilities apply equally to men and women?

If No in respect of any jobs; ask for all first (i) then (ii).

(i) In what ways do they differ?

(ii) Apart from what you've already told me, do the facilities for men and women differ in respect of any of the ways shown on this card?

Provision of day release
Provision of block release
Location of training
Wages during training
Length of training
Methods of training
No

*Do you have a firm's pensions scheme or schemes at this establishment? (If more than one scheme, record answers for each separately)

If Yes To which categories of employees does it apply?
Is it contributory or non-contributory?
Is it voluntary or compulsory?
Does it apply to both men and women?

If men only: Why are women not included?

If both: Are the terms and conditions different for men and women in respect of any of the following?

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT

Admission to scheme (specify)
Contributions
Retirement age
Amount of pension in relation to pay
Other ways (specify)
None of these

If any different: Why are they not the same for men and women?

---

*Does the firm have a sick pay scheme or schemes for any categories of employees at this establishment? (Include informal arrangements. If more than one scheme, record answers for each separately).

If Yes: To which categories of employees does it apply?
What is the basis of the scheme? (Probe for amount of sick pay and length of time paid)

Is the *amount* of sick pay dependent on:

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT CODE ALL THAT APPLY

category of employee?
overall length of service?
length of service in category?
sex of employee?
any other factors (specify)?
None of these

Is the *length of time* for which sick pay is paid dependent on:

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT CODE ALL THAT APPLY

category of employee?
overall length of service?
length of service in category?
sex of employee?
any other factors (specify)?
None of these

Now I'd like to talk about ways of making appointments to different kinds of jobs.
If a vacancy occurs in a senior managerial post (office supervisory post/works supervisory post/sales supervisory post) in this establishment, do you find you are able to fill it by promotion within the establishment or the firm or do you find you have to make an appointment from outside?

Ask following questions in respect of each job.

If promote within establishment/firm

What procedures do you use in making promotions within the establishment/firm?

Would a woman be considered for such a part?

If Yes: If a woman were promoted, would her pay and working conditions be the same as a man's? (if different, specify in what ways).

If No: Why would a woman not be considered for such a post?

If an answer such as "no women with necessary qualifications"

If a woman with suitable qualifications applied, would she be considered?

If appoint from outside firm

When seeking to make an appointment from outside the firm, do you:

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT CODE ALL THAT APPLY	Notify the Department of Employment?
	Notify a private employment agency?
	Advertise?
	Take other measures (specify)?

Do you specify the qualifications needed for the post?

If Yes: What do you specify?

Do you specify the sex required? (Yes – man; – woman; – varies. No).

If Yes – varies: In what circumstances would you specify a man and in what circumstances a woman?

If a woman with suitable qualifications applied, would she be considered?

If Yes: If a woman were appointed, would her pay and conditions be the same as for a man?
(If different, specify in what ways).

If No; Why would a woman not be considered for such a post?

As you most likely are aware, the Equal Pay Act lays it down that women workers must be paid the same rate as men doing the same or broadly similar work, by the end of 1975. What steps have you taken towards equal pay in this establishment?

There has been a great deal of discussion recently about the effects of introducing equal pay for men and women.

(Can I just check) Has equal pay for all men and women doing the same or broadly similar work been introduced in this establishment?

If equal pay for all How long have all men and women doing the same or broadly similar work received equal pay in this establishment?

If equal pay for 2 years or more

What have been the effects of introducing equal pay for men and women in this establishment?

Has the number of women employed in this establishment increased, remained about the same or decreased since equal pay was introduced?

Has the range of jobs in which women are employed in this establishment increased, remained the same or decreased since equal pay was introduced?

Have there been more, about the same or less opportunities for promotion for women in this establishment since equal pay was introduced?

Have women been given more, about the same or less opportunities for training in this establishment since equal pay was introduced?

IF EQUAL PAY NOT YET INTRODUCED OR ONLY WITHIN LAST TWO YEARS

What do you think will be the effects of introducing equal pay for men and women in this establishment?

Do you think the number of women employed in this establishment will increase, remain the same or decrease when equal pay is introduced (now that equal pay has been introduced)?

Do you think the range of jobs in which women are employed in this establishment will increase, remain about the same or decrease when equal pay is introduced (now that equal pay has been introduced)?

Do you think there will be more, about the same or less opportunities for promotion for women in this establishment when equal pay is introduced (now that equal pay has been introduced)?

Do you think that women will be given more, about the same or less opportunities for training in this establishment when equal pay is introduced (now that equal pay has been introduced)?

ASK ALL

How do you yourself feel about equal pay?

So on the whole, would you say you are in favour, have no strong feelings either way, or are against equal pay for men and women?

How do your men colleagues feel about equal pay? On the whole, would you say they are in favour, have no strong feelings either way, or are against equal pay for men and women?

How do your women colleagues feel about equal pay. On the whole would you say they are in favour, have no strong feelings either way, or are against equal pay for men and women?

How do the people who work for you feel about equal pay? On the whole, would you say they are in favour, have no strong feelings either way, or are against equal pay for men and women?

*Do you personally negotiate with trade unions on the question of women's wages and/or salaries?

**If Yes:* Have you had any negotiations with any trade unions on the implementation of the Equal Pay Act?

If Yes: With which unions?

What have been the results so far of these negotiations?

**If No* Have you any plans for discussions with the trade unions on the implementation of the Act?

*Do you personally negotiate with trade unions on other matters of special importance to women?
If Yes: What kind of matters?

Do you think there are any jobs in this establishment which NO woman could do?

If Yes: Which jobs?

ASK IN RESPECT OF EACH JOB

Why could a woman not do this job?

If answer such as "none with right training/qualifications" ask:

Given the right kind of training, could a woman do this job?

Could the job be modified so that a woman could do it?

Do you think there are any jobs in this establishment which NO man could do?

If Yes: Which jobs?

ASK IN RESPECT OF EACH JOB

Why could a man not do this job?

If answer such as "none with right training/qualifications" ask:

Given the right kind of training, could a man do this job?

Could the job be modified so that a man could do it?

Now I'd like to ask you about your views on men and women workers.

*Can you tell me whether, in general, you think men or women are better at:—

- being punctual
- working hard
- working conscientiously
- NOT taking days off for sickness
- NOT taking days off for other reasons
- staying with one form and not moving from one to another
- carrying out instructions
- working safely

*Are there any (other) ways in which you think men are better workers than women?

*Are there any (other) ways in which you think women are better workers than men?

I'd like to ask you now about your views on part-time workers.
(Even if you don't employ part-timers you may have views about them as workers.)

What do you think are the advantages of employing part-time workers?

And what are the disadvantages?

Now I'd like to talk about various aspects of employee performance.

First of all, from your experience in this establishment, do you find that any kinds of employees are more liable than others to sickness absence?

If Yes: Which kinds of employees?

Within each of these groups, which are more liable to sickness absence, men or women?

Can you tell me whether in general, you think

younger or older women
younger or older men
single or married women
single or married men
part-timers or full-timers
unskilled or skilled women

are better at:

a) working hard
b) staying with one firm and not moving from one to another
c) NOT taking days off for sickness
d) NOT taking days off for other reasons

Does the firm keep detailed records for this establishment of sickness absence, other absence and labour turnover, by such factors as age, sex and marital status?

I am going to read out a number of statements about women workers in general. Will you please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each?

I would prefer to have only men working here

Industry could not carry on without women workers

I would not like to have a male secretary

Women are more conscientious workers than men

Women are less likely than men to take industrial action

Woman's place is in the home

Married women with children are less reliable workers

Older married women are more stable employees than men

It is not worth training young women for more skilled work because they leave after a few years to have families

Part-time workers are a nuisance.

Here is a list of facilities which some firms provide to help their employees. Show card.
Which of them does this firm provide?

hich of the facilities provided are most effective in improving the performance of the *men* who work for you?

hich of the facilities provided are most effective in improving the performance of the *women* who work for you?

Part time work
Flexible hours
Opportunities for shopping
Child care facilities including day nurseries
Paid maternity leave (WOMEN ONLY)
Job guarantee after maternity (WOMEN ONLY)
Training for better jobs
Paid sick leave

A great deal has been said recently about the small numbers of women who rise to senior positions or do skilled work. What in your opinion, are the reasons for this state of affairs?

*Do you think it would be a good or bad thing if more women occupied senior positions?

*Are there any reasons why you say it's a good/bad thing?

*Do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing if more women were trained for some sort of highly skilled work?

*Are there any reasons why you say it's a good/bad thing?

*I would like your views on what, if anything, you think various bodies could do to improve the opportunities women have for getting better jobs?

*First of all, what, if anything could this firm do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

*what, if anything could the Government do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

*What, if anything, could the trade unions do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

*Is there anything else you think could be done to improve women's opportunities in general?

**If Yes:*   What else do you think could be done?

I am going to read out a number of statements which have been made about women in senior positions. Will you please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each?

Statement
A woman has to be twice as good as a man to get half as far
Women in senior positions are often more conscientious than men
Women are too apt to be influenced by personal considerations
Women are not ruthless enough
Women have a more human attitude on many things
The only women who get to the top are those who are lacking in feminine qualities
Men make better leaders than women
Women are better than men at dealing with people
Women are best employed on easy work leaving men free to concentrate on more difficult things
Men dislike taking orders from a woman
Women dislike working for women
Women who held responsible positions before leaving to have a family should be given re-training on their return to work
TO MEN ONLY A suitably qualified woman could do my job as well as a man
TO WOMEN ONLY A suitably qualified man could do my job as well as a woman
ASK ALL Women in senior positions are not acceptable to those they have to deal with outside

Appendix II (d) Preliminary information from implementers

REFER TO TABLE 1

I understand that in this establishment the following categories are employed.
READ CATEGORIES FROM TABLE 1.

(a) For which of these categories of employees are you responsible for implementing personnel policy?
LIST IN COLUMN (a)

(b) Are there any groups doing different types of work within these categories for which personnel policy differs? IF ANY, RECORD BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF WORK.

(c) FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP CODE WHETHER MEN/WOMEN EMPLOYED AND WHETHER FULL OR PART TIME.

(a)	(b)	(c)			
CATEGORY	GROUP	Men full time	Men part time	Women full time	Women part time
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4
		1	2	3	4

Appendix II (e) Questions asked of implementers

QUESTIONS ASKED OF IMPLEMENTERS

Person responsible for implementing firm's personnel policy to women

Post held by informant

To whom is informant responsible?

To whom is informant responsible?

Sex of informant

Can you please tell me exactly what your job consists of?

Can I check, are you responsible for engaging any employees in this establishment?

IF INFORMANT RESPONSIBLE FOR ENGAGING EMPLOYEES

Which of the categories/groups of employees do you engage? Refer to SHEET A

ASK FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP IN WHICH EMPLOYEES ENGAGED BY INFORMANT

Do you engage both men and women in this category?

SHOW CARD

Which of these attributes do you consider important when engaging employees in this category?
(The attributes listed on the card were: previous experience; training; educational attainments; physical characteristics; personality characteristics; attainment in tests; domestic circumstances; wage/salary required; age).

PROBE ATTRIBUTES MENTIONED FOR BRIEF DETAILS

Are any other attributes important when engaging employees in this category?

Are you more likely to find these attributes in men or women applicants?

If a man and a woman with identical attributes applied for the same job in this category/group, which would you be more likely to take on?

IF MAN/WOMAN

For what reasons would you be more likely to take on a man/woman?

REFER TO SHEET A **FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP IN WHICH FULL TIMERS ARE EMPLOYED, ASK**

What are the basic hours per week worked by men and women in this category/group?

Are there opportunities for any employees in this category/group to work paid overtime on a regular basis? By regular I mean some overtime in at least 3 weeks out of 4 weeks?

IF OPPORTUNITIES FOR REGULAR OVERTIME IN CATEGORY/GROUP IN WHICH BOTH MEN AND WOMEN EMPLOYED

Do both men and women in this category/group work paid overtime on a regular basis?

IF MEN/WOMEN ONLY Why do women (men) not work overtime?

REFER TO SHEET A

FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP IN WHICH MEN AND WOMEN FULL-TIMERS ARE EMPLOYED, ASK

Do any of the employees in this category/group work shifts?

IF SHIFTS WORKED Do both men and women in this category/group work shifts?

IF MEN/WOMEN ONLY

What are the reasons for women (men) not working shifts?

Do you find the laws regulating women's work cause difficulties in employing them to the best advantage?

**If yes:* What kinds of difficulties do they cause?
*Would you like to see any changes in the laws regulating women's work?
**If Yes:* What changes would you like to see made?

---

*Are any trade unions recognised by this establishment?

Do you have a firm's pension scheme at this establishment?

Does the firm have a sick pay scheme at this establishment?

REFER TO SHEET A **TO ALL EMPLOYING PART–TIMERS**

Now I'd like to talk about part-time employees.
*May I just check, I believe you employ part-timers as ,............... (list categories/groups)

FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP LISTED, ASK

*What are the basic hours per week worked by men and women in this category/group?

IF MEN AND WOMEN IN SAME CATEGORY/GROUP WORK DIFFERENT HOURS, ASK

*What are the reasons for men and women working different hours in this category/group?

Are part-timers allowed any flexibility in the arrangement of the hours they work?

***ALL WHO EMPLOY WOMEN PART-TIME:** How long have you employed women part-time?

***ALL WHO EMPLOY MEN PART-TIME:** How long have you employed men part-time?

REFER TO SHEET A

ALL WHO EMPLOY BOTH FULL-TIMERS AND PART-TIMERS IN THE SAME CATEGORY/GROUP

May I just check, you mentioned that you employ both full-timers and part-timers as .... (list category/group).

FOR EACH CATEGORY/GROUP LISTED

In this category/group are part-timers eligible for promotion to the same level as full-timers, to a lower level, or are they not eligible for promotion at all?

ALL EMPLOYING PART-TIMERS

Are any part-timers eligible for the firm's pension scheme?

If Yes: Which categories/groups of part-timers are eligible?

*Are the terms and conditions different for full and part-timers in respect of any of the following?

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT
CODE ALL
THAT APPLY

Admission to scheme
Contributions
Retirement age
Amount of pension in relation to pay
Other ways (specify)

Are any part-timers eligible for the firm's sick-pay scheme?

If Yes: *Which categories/groups of part-timers are eligible?

*Is either the amount of sick pay or the length of time for which it is paid different for full and part-timers in respect of any of the following?

INDIVIDUAL
PROMPT

CODE ALL
THAT APPLY

Basic hours per week
Length of service
Other factors (specify)
None of these

Are any part-timers given facilities to obtain further education or training, either by the firm or an outside organisation?

If Yes: *Which categories of part-timers are given training facilities?
*Are these facilities the same as for full-timers?

If No: *In what way are the facilities different?

ASK ALL

Has the question of employing any (more) part-timers ever been considered?

If Yes: For which jobs has their employment been considered?
*Did you consider employing men only, women only or both?
*Have you definitely decided whether or not to employ (more) part-timers?

If decided not to employ (more) part-timers

*Why have you decided not to employ (more) part-timers?
*Has the rate of National Insurance Contributions affected your decision?

If decided to employ (more) part-timers

*Is there any reason why you are employing none (no more) at present?

If question of employing (more) part-timers has not been considered

*If the question of employing (more) part-timers came under discussion, would you personally be in favour or not?

*Why would you (not) be in favour?

Now I'd like to talk about aspects of personnel policy which apply only to women employees.

*First of all, can you tell me approximately what proportion of the *full-time* women employees are married? Is it all, three-quarters, a half, a quarter or none at all?

REPEAT FOR "Have children of school age" "have children of pre-school age"

*Can you tell me approximately what proportion of the *part-time* women employees are married? Is it all, three quarters, a half, a quarter, or none at all?

REPEAT FOR "Have children of school age" "have children of pre-school age"

NOTE: IF DETAILS OF AGES OF CHILDREN ARE NOT AVAILABLE GIVE DETAILS OF PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN WITH CHILDREN OF ANY AGE

Can you tell me whether this firm:

INDIVIDUAL PROMPT
CODE ALL
THAT APPLY

offers paid maternity leave to any women
has a formal arrangement for unpaid maternity leave
has informal arrangements for women to take maternity leave
does not give maternity leave
has no arrangements because the need has not arisen
other (specify)
none of these

ASK ALL WHO OFFER PAID MATERNITY LEAVE

*Is paid maternity leave offered to all women or only some?

If Some Which women are able to take paid maternity leave?

*How long does paid maternity leave last?

ASK ALL WHO HAVE A FORMAL ARRANGEMENT FOR UNPAID MATERNITY LEAVE

*Are all women able to take unpaid maternity leave under a formal arrangement, or only some?

If Some Which women are able to take unpaid maternity leave?

*How long does unpaid maternity leave last?

ASK ALL WHO HAVE INFORMAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERNITY LEAVE

*Which women are able to take maternity leave on an informal basis?
*What factors determine whether a woman can take maternity leave?

ASK ALL WHO HAVE ANY ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERNITY LEAVE

Do the arrangements you have mentioned apply to both married and unmarried women?
When a woman returns to work after taking paid/formal unpaid/informal maternity leave does she retain any rights she may have to: seniority, eligibility for sick pay; eligibility for paid holiday; eligibility for pension.

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT OFFER PAID MATERNITY LEAVE

Has the question of paid maternity leave ever been considered by management?
Has the question of paid maternity leave ever been raised by the trade unions?

ASK ALL

If a woman who has worked for the firm before returns to the same job after several years at home what provision is made for retraining her?

If previous experience is taken into account

*If a woman has previously worked at a similar job in another firm and came to you after several years at home would you take account of her previous experience or treat her as a new entrant with respect to training?

If relevant experience taken into account

*If a woman with experience of a different job came to you after several years at home would she be treated the same as other new entrants?

Does this establishment have any formal policy about time off for mothers whose children are ill or who have other problems connected with their children?

If Yes: What is the formal policy?

If No; What usually happens when children are ill?

What, approximately, is the annual percentage rate of labour turnover among women employees at this establishment?

PROMPT AS NECESSARY

Less than 5%
5–24%
25–49%
50–74%
75–99%
100% or more

*Is this rate similar for all categories/groups of women employees, or do some have higher or lower rates of turnover?

*What are the main reasons for leaving given by women employees?

As you may know, a law has been passed to make it compulsory for an employer to pay the same wages to men and women doing the same or broadly similar work.

*How do you yourself feel about equal pay?

*So on the whole, would you say you:

RUNNING PROMPT

are in favour
have no strong feelings either way
or are against

Do you personally negotiate with trade unions on the question of women's wages and salaries?
Do you personally negotiate with trade unions on other matters of special importance to women?

If Yes: What kind of matters?

Now I'd like to ask you about your views on men and women workers.
Can you tell me whether, in general you think men or women are better at:—

being punctual
working hard
working conscientiously
NOT taking days off for sickness
NOT taking days off for other reasons
staying with one firm and not moving from one to another
carrying out instructions
working safely

Are there any (other) ways in which you think men are better workers than women?
Are there any (other) ways in which you think women are better workers than men?

Now I'd like to talk about various aspects of employee performance.

*First of all, from your experience in this establishment, do you find that any kinds of employees are more liable than others to sickness absence?

If Yes *Which kinds of employees?
*Within each of these groups, which are more liable to sickness absence, men or women?

*Can you tell me whether in general, you think

(i) younger or older women
(ii) younger or older men
(iii) single or married women
(iv) single or married men
(v) part-timers or full-timers
(vi) unskilled or skilled women

are better at:—

a) working hard
b) Staying with one firm and not moving from one to another
c) NOT taking days off for sickness
d) NOT taking days for other reasons

Here is a list of facilities which some firms provide to help their employees. Which of them does this firm provide?

Which of the facilities provided are most effective in improving the performance of the *men* who work for you?

Which of the facilities provided are most effective in improving the performance of the *women* who work for you?

Part time work
Flexible hours
Opportunities for shopping
Child care facilities including day nurseries
Paid maternity leave (WOMEN ONLY)
Job guarantee after maternity (WOMEN ONLY)
Training for better jobs
Paid sick leave

A great deal has been said recently about the small numbers of women who rise to senior positions or do skilled work. What, in your opinion, are the reasons for this state of affairs?

Do you think it would be a good or bad thing if more women occupied senior positions?
Are there any reasons why you say it's a good/bad thing?

Do you think it would be a good thing or a bad thing if more women were trained for some sort of highly skilled work?

Are there any reasons why you say it's a good/bad thing?

I would like your views on what, if anything, you think various bodies could do to improve the opportunities women have for getting better jobs?

First of all, what, if anything could this firm do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

What, if anything could the Government do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

What, if anything, could the trade unions do to improve women's opportunities of getting better jobs?

Is there anything else you think could be done to improve women's opportunities in general?

If Yes: What else do you think could be done?

Printed in England for Her Majesty's Stationery Office by Swift Printers Ltd., F2596 Gp 1093 Dd 506588 K14 5/75

SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Date of Issue

875

HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

Government Bookshops

49 High Holborn, London WC1V 6HB
13a Castle Street, Edinburgh EH2 3AR
41 The Hayes, Cardiff CF1 1JW
Brazennose Street, Manchester M60 8AS
Southey House, Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ
258 Broad Street, Birmingham B1 2HE
80 Chichester Street, Belfast BT1 4JY

Government Publications are also available through booksellers

ISBN 0 11 700691 2